DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 501 HE 001 252

AUTHOR	Morison, Robert S.
TITLE	The President's Commission on Student Involvement in Decision-Making. The Chairman's Report.
INSTITUTION	Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y.
PUB DATE	11 Jun 69
NOTE	99p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.05
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy, Change Agents, Decision Making, Educational Environment, *Educational Objectives, *Governance, *Higher Education, Institutional Role, Participant Involvement, *Social Responsibility, Student Development, *Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*Cornell University

ABSTRACT

This report is based on the premise that the principal functions of the modern university are teaching, research, and public service. The first section of the report briefly reviews these three functions and discusses: (1) the development of relationships between the university and society, particularly as this development has occurred in the United States; (2) the complex nature of university administration, including academic and central administration, and auxiliary but quasi-independent enterprises; and (3) reasons underlying student discontent and how they are related to the quality of a student's life as a member of the university community, to the quality of his educational experience, and to his relationships to the university as a concerned citizen. The second section of the report recommends administrative changes that could be undertaken for the distribution of institutional government within the existing framework of Cornell University in particular and at any university in general. This discussion covers Cornell University's academic matters and educational environment as they relate to student development; the need for a new administrative device for dealing with major policy issues; and fundamental issues concerning the university's relationship to US national policy. (WM)

ED034501

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION-MAKING

THE CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

2nd Printing
June 11, 1969

Professor Robert S. Morison
Roberts Hall
Cornell University

HE001252

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED034501

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Robert S. Morison, Director, Division of Biological Sciences, Chairman
Jon Anderson, Director, Office of Information Systems
Mark Barlow, Vice President for Student Affairs
Sarah Diamant, History, graduate student
Steven Hadley, Arts '69
F. A. Long, Vice President for Research
Ian Macneil, Professor, Law
Richard Marchase, Engineering '70
Robert D. Miller, Dean of the Faculty
David Moore, Dean, Industrial and Labor Relations School
Raymond Thorpe, Professor, Chemical Engineering
William Tomlinson, Education, graduate student
Michael Wright, Engineering '69

Sheila Tobias, Executive Secretary

NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
A Statutory College of the State University

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
DIVISION OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
ITHACA, N.Y. 14850

Office of the Director
201 Roberts Hall

May 26, 1969

Dear Mr. President:

I have the honor to transmit to you the report of the Chairman of the Commission you appointed last June to look into the governance of Cornell University with special reference to the role of students. Let me emphasize at once that the report is in no sense a statement of the Commission as a whole. It is simply the Chairman's attempt to summarize the major points of discussion with special emphasis on those that bear particularly on the design of new organizational arrangements. Several different points of view are included, but the primary position from which the report is written is still a personal one. Perhaps the best way of regarding it is as a statement of what the Chairman has learned from participating in the discussions. May he hasten to add that this apparently egocentric procedure did not originate with him but was urged by essentially the entire membership of the Commission. Included in the body of the report are two fairly long passages prepared by other members of the Commission on subjects in which they had special interest and competence. This report will be followed later by other papers prepared by the individual members of the Commission. These are expected to deal in more depth with certain of the topics included in the Chairman's report and in several instances they may express different points of view.

We have chosen this admittedly somewhat cumbersome method of reporting for a number of reasons. In the first place, we feel that an effort to produce a conventional consensus report would fail to convey the complexity and the richness of the experience we have been through together. In so doing it would gloss over and obscure certain key issues which must be dealt with in the future if orderly progress towards the high objectives of the University is to be maintained.

A second reason for deciding not to proceed towards a single limited set of recommendations grows out of our awareness of the unrepresentativeness of the Commission as now constituted. Even if we were to emerge with a set of unanimous recommendations, the University community would be most unlikely to accept them without further prolonged debate. The student members of the Commission were chosen primarily because of their proven interest in changing existing arrangements rather than for their identification with majority points of view. Although all the non-student members are nominally members of the faculties of the various colleges, many of them are now more closely identified with the administration. It is particularly regrettable that the two representatives of the tradition of humane letters found it necessary to withdraw from our discussions.

Nevertheless, those of us who remain feel that we have learned a great deal from one another about how the University works and where many of the roots of current dissatisfaction lie. Indeed our very awareness of the fact that we could not satisfactorily represent the views of the community as a whole may have freed us to explore some areas with more intensity than we otherwise could.

Many members of the Commission have lately become concerned that the report does not start from the premise that the fundamental job of the University is to carry on all of its educational, research and public service activities in an atmosphere of open inquiry and free expression. Those members believe that all proposals either for maintenance of the status quo or for reform must be explicitly tested against that premise. The report does not follow such a pattern. Some of those members believe that the conclusions in the report are not on that account necessarily suspect. Others believe that a report not explicitly founded on the primacy of free inquiry and expression is so likely to result in conclusions infringing academic freedom of students and faculty that they cannot concur in the report. Prof. Ian Macneil has stated that he will write a comment elaborating on the latter viewpoint.

We had hoped to produce a more polished document which would include the supplementary papers expected from other members of the Commission. The imminent establishment of a constituent assembly to consider from a far more representative base the subjects previously dealt with by this Commission makes it desirable to provide the results of our deliberations as promptly as possible, even at some sacrifice to form and finish. The Chairman must take entire responsibility not only for the substance of the opinions expressed but for the unfinished and awkward nature of their presentation. On the other hand, he must acknowledge his indebtedness to the individual members of the Commission for suggesting and formulating many of the ideas and opinions which provided the basis of the report. Indeed he must confess that he emerges from this year's experience with almost none of his previous assumptions completely intact and with several entirely new conceptions.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Morison

Robert S. Morison, M.D.
Director

President James A. Perkins
300 Day Hall

CONTENTS

PAGE

Part I The Present State of Affairs

Introduction: Purposes and Functions 1
A. The university as part of a larger society 3
B. The formal administration apparatus 13
C. The student and his discontents 21
  1. The encounter with the community 23
  2. The student as decision maker and the feeling of powerlessness 34

Part II Suggestions for Change

Introduction

Specific Proposals 47
A. Academic Matters 49
  1. Strengthening the student as an individual decision maker 49
    a. Relieving rigidities in requirements 49
    b. Improving informative courses 49
    c. Better explanation of educational policy issues 50
    d. Improving advisory system 50
    e. Shopping around 51
    f. Independent study and research 51
  2. Student participation in formal decision making 52
    a. General considerations 52
    b. Course committees or workshops 54
    c. Departmental committees 55
    d. Selection and representation 57
B. Quality of Community 59
  1. General Considerations 59
  2 Management of the University Community 60
    a. Housing and dining 60
    b. Other management problems 61
    c. Student conduct 62
  3. Various student activities 62
C. The Making of Overall Policy 63
  1. General Considerations 63
  2. A University Senate or Council? 64
  3. Representation and other problems involved with student participation (by Steve Hadley) 67
D. The University and National Policy 78

Working Bibliography 84

General Bibliography 86

PART I

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY

A great university like Cornell exists for several purposes and fulfills several functions in society. Some of these are ancient and well recognized, others are more recent. Some of the more recent functions have been thrust upon the University, and not all of its members may even realize that the University is engaged in them.

There is even some controversy as to whether the University is in a healthy or decadent state. If rapid growth is a criterion of health, the University has certainly been a healthy organism during the last several decades. But many of its present ills may reasonably be traced to distortions or inequalities in the growth process. Many observers would feel, for example, that the faculty, and student body together with the complexity and cost of their day to day activities have developed far faster than an administrative apparatus originally designed to cope with the very modest material needs of a smaller and relatively isolated company of scholars.

Any effort to redesign or modify the apparatus by which the modern university is governed may well begin with a brief review of both its historic and its more contemporary functions. The solutions of certain kinds of problems in a great university will necessarily be different from those that may be appropriate to a small liberal arts college, simply because it is expected to fulfill a larger number of purposes.

At the risk of belaboring the obvious, let us begin then by reminding ourselves that the modern university has three great purposes: teaching, research and public service. We like to think of these three as being mutually supportive and evenly balanced but, of course, this is rarely the case. It is generally agreed, however, that as a general principle, teaching and research should be closely coupled. Indeed, at the advanced level, teaching is unthinkable without the existence of research; and in the long run, research suffers if it loses contact with the oncoming generation. On the other hand, it often appears that too great an emphasis on research in the distribution of funds and as the only criterion for academic promotion, acts to reduce the efforts of the best men in teaching. Conversely, too heavy a teaching load impairs both teaching and research.

Similarly, the American university is usually praised by observers both at home and abroad for its participation in community affairs in contrast to the more limited scope of its historic counterparts in Europe. The initiative provided by the Morrill Act is regarded as one of the real milestones in higher education, since it placed the university's participation in the mechanical and agricultural acts on the same plane with the classical devotion to the professions of theology, medicine and law. Many of us are here at Cornell in large part because of the value we set on the University's participation in the real world through research on problems of immediate practical importance and by extending its educational services to the producing community. On the other hand, we are not unaware of the dangers to more basic investigations and to broader, more general education that can come from too great a preoccupation with practical problems. The point of these reflections for those who must comment on or redesign the governing apparatus is to remind them to bear in mind the crucial importance of making the machinery capable of maintaining a proper equilibrium among these three major forces.

Even within each of these three great areas, forces and tensions exist which are far from automatically balanced. The promotion of graduate education does not necessarily carry with it a concomitant improvment in undergraduate education, and vice versa. Indeed, there is substantial opinion that traces many of the current ills of undergraduate education to the specialization and professionalization of learning in the graduate schools that dominate most of our leading unversities.* On the other hand, it must be remembered that the demand for increased graduate education both from the individuals enjoying that education and from a society that increasingly needs its products is a real thing and not an artifact of an ingrown system. It will take much thought and careful planning to improve undergraduate education and graduate education at the same time and with the same means.

The problems of balancing research and teaching or undergraduate and graduate education are at least familiar and perhaps not beyond the reach of existing mechanisms and concepts. Problems arising from the public service function are newer and far less well understood. Lack of examination and consequent lack of understanding of these relationships appears to underly much of the misunderstandings and consequent unrest within the University itself. It therefore appears desirable to devote a special section of this report to a brief review of the development of relations between the University and the society as this development has occurred especially in the United States.

---

* W. Allen Wallis, "Centripetal and Centrifugal Forces in University Organization," Daedelus, Fall, 1964, Vol. 93 #4, p. 1071.

I. A. THE UNIVERSITY AS A PART OF A LARGER SOCIETY

Since there is a tendency on the part of all academic people, faculty and students alike, to regard themselves as objects of special interest and concern, it is well to remind ourselves that the institution we serve and the benefits we enjoy are generously supported by society at large. Some, but by no means the major part of this support is prompted by an appreciation of the beauty and dignity of pure knowledge. Somewhat more important perhaps is the recognition that education, on balance, makes it possible for more individuals to lead lives satisfactory to themselves. The preponderant interest of society, however, is in the role of the University in abolishing hunger, lightening and load of pain and illness, and bringing all kinds of other comforts and excitement to the pursuit of happiness. To this must reluctantly be added, since men have not learned to live with other men on a large scale, the fact that the university is called upon to contribute to the common defense.

In the beginning, most educational institutions were designed to transmit a rather limited body of knowledge already reasonably well agreed to by the society as a whole. It rapidly became apparent, however, that the kind of people interested in giving their lives to higher education were not interested in merely transmitting agreed upon truths. On the whole, the best of them seemed to get their greatest satisfaction in questioning old truths and developing new ones. Society at large was originally somewhat perplexed and dismayed by this tendency, but over the 1,000 or so years of its existence, the Western University has succeeded in convincing its constituency that in the long run Society will benefit most by allowing scholars a very high degree of freedom to explore new areas of knowledge and to teach what they think they have found to the next generation of students without restriction.

It soon developed that in order to give individual faculty and students the necessary freedom to follow or teach any doctrine they wished, the university as an institution had to withdraw itself from taking any formal position on matters of scholarly controversy. Today we have reached the point at which the university can scarcely be recorded as for anything at all except the freedom of its faculty to be for anything they like. All this implies a kind of disengagement of the university from the workings of society, in return for which society disengages itself from meddling with the internal workings of the university.

The situation is in practice a good deal more complicated than described above. Although most good universities jealously guard the rights of their faculty to freedom of thought and expression, and although they usually refrain from commenting officially on matters of political controversy, all universities feel obligated to involve themselves with the needs of society in several other ways. Often at considerable cost to the ideal of freedom described above, the university will recognize a duty to provide training and education in those professions which the society indicates that it needs. Equally important is the commitment to do research on problems of recognized importance to the community. Nowhere are those policies more clearly seen than in the establishment of the land grant colleges in this country approximately a century ago. Nothing could be more explicit than the statement of the purposes of these institutions to advance the practical arts of engineering, agriculture, and military tactics.

The relationships between the agricultural department and their constituencies have been particularly close, and illustrate clearly how far a university may in practice extend itself into the community. All agricultural colleges maintain faculty members whose principal business it is to take the knowledge generated on the campus into the fields and homes of the surrounding farming community. Conversely, problems identified in the field are brought back to the campus for investigation. Much of the research concerns the effects of foodstuffs, pesticides, and fertilizers and the results are of importance to industry as well as to farmers. There is, of course, no question that this close triangular relationship among the university, the farming community and industry has been immensely important in increasing the productivity of agriculture and raising the standard of living of at least a considerable portion of the rural community.

The increases in productivity which were the primary targets of the enterprise have, of course, resulted in revolutionary changes in society, most notable perhaps being the migration of the great majority of the rural population to the city. This migration has in turn brought all kinds of changes, both desirable and undesirable, in its wake. Other unanticipated side effects such as the contamination of the environment with pesticides and the overfertilization of lakes and streams are posing problems of increasing social, economic, and political importance. Now the University is turning its attention increasingly to these secondary effects of its original interventions. Clearly, the university had had and continues to have immediate, direct, and explicit impacts on society, a situation quite different from the theoretical detachment described in the opening paragraphs of this section.

What about the reciprocal effect of the farming community and agri-business on the university? The research program of a good college of agriculture covers a very wide range, from such basic topics as theoretical genetics and biochemistry to the action of specific pesticides in protecting certain crops of economic importance. In principle, members of the faculty appear to be free to choose their own research programs; and in practice, the great majority probably feel reasonably free of constraints. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that colleges in states which grow a lot of cotton do more research on cotton than do their sister institutions in the North. Much of this concentration on problems of local importance comes about in ways which do not seriously or obviously interfere with traditional academic freedoms. In its simplest terms, the situation is one in which a dean finds it relatively easy to find funds from the legislature or from industry to solve certain kinds of problems. This money is then used to support the work of faculty already interested in such problems or to attract people from elsewhere with these interests. Other more obscure forms of pressure may from time to time be used to persuade investigators to take up problems of special local importance, but only very rarely would an attempt be made to force a faculty member into research he prefers not to do. Experience shows that an investigator is not likely to turn out anything very useful under such conditions.

We have begun by discussing the relationship of the land grant college to the rural community, since it appears to be the simplest and most agreeable case. Certainly the relationship was intended to be a close one, the intention was clearly stated, and practical development has followed the intended blueprint very closely. The results have been very generally applauded.

With this model in mind, we may turn now to the much more complex relationship between the university as a whole and society as a whole. Anything like a complete treatment would require a book rather than a section of a committee report. Nevertheless, we feel the need of discussing a few of the major issues. This need arises in part from the growing feeling that the University does in fact affect social and political decisions more than is generally recognized, and than it cares to admit. These considerations in turn prompt the suggestion that the present arrangements for making policy decisions involving interchanges between society and the university should be carefully examined and perhaps modified.

Although a university as an institution rarely if ever takes explicit positions on one side or another of controversial social or political questions, it has the capacity to influence such decisions in a variety of ways. How much the university in fact exercises this influence, how much of such exercise is conscious and deliberate, and how much inadverent, above all whether a university should consciously try to direct the course of political or social action are all questions on which there is considerable disagreement. What then are the ways in which the university might influence the course of affairs?

1. Clearly the most important long term influence is wrought by the students who are trained and educated at the university and later bring their expertise, their sense of values, and their wisdom to bear on questions of public interest.
2. Equally important and closely linked with the production of trained people, is the production of new ideas and technologies for the guidance of society in new directions, improvements in production, the protection of the public health and, as we reluctantly admitted before, the promotion of the common defense. As we all increasingly realize, it is naive to regard any of these "advances" as an unquestioned good. Each, as a matter of fact, brings with it those undesirable side effects which in turn demand further research.

   Though in theory, the university takes only limited responsibility for and exerts little authority over the direction taken by the research done within its walls, in practice it may guide research by accepting certain types of appropriations and grants and refusing others. It may quite consciously direct the course of investigation by giving a position to an investigator who is known to be engaged in work of the desired character. Indeed, a whole group of workers may be assembled in a department or center explicitly devoted to the solution of a particular set of problems.
3. Though the university as a corporate entity takes no position on public issues, its personnel are encouraged to do so as individuals. More significantly, they serve in innumerable roles as consultants to both government and industry. The university thus has, at least indirectly, an important influence on decision making.
4. By providing the use of its facilities to outside agencies, e.g., for recruitment into the armed forces or industrial establishments, the university may appear to be tacitly expressing approval for the other acts and policies of the agencies in question.
5. By investing its funds in certain companies, the university may be thought to express approval and even encouragement of that company's policies on social and political matters. Conversely, it can express disapproval by selling its stock. More serious in its direct effects perhaps is the power to affect social change by buying up and managing real estate, especially in urban areas.

6. As an employer of labor, the university is in a position to express approval or disapproval of such controversial matters as the open shop, minimum wages, the handling of migrant labor and so on.
7. Finally, in matters affecting its own welfare the university quite openly attempts to influence legislative and executive decisions through conventional lobbying practices either by itself or as part of such trade associations as the American Association of Land Grant Colleges.

The foregoing are in a summary the principal ways in which the university may influence decision making in society as a whole. Different observers can and, in fact, do differ quite sharply on the degree to which a university exercises these powers and on the significance of some of the listed activities. Does investment in the Chase National Bank, for example, imply approval of the doctrine of Apartheid? Or does the temporary assignment of a room to the Dow Chemical Company imply approval of use of napalm in Viet Nam? Does acceptance of a military contract to investigate the metabolism of the malarial parasite imply that the university or, for that matter, the individual invistigator approves of the Viet Nam War? By allowing its faculty to act as consultants to the industrial military complex, does the university help to ensure the overall wisdom of decisions made by the complex or increase the strangle hold of the complex on the American economy?

The Commission certainly arrived at no answers to these questions or the many more like them that could be asked. It recognizes, however, that differences of view within the university in regard to these matters is at present an important source of unrest. Even the most conservative of us recognizes an uncomfortable asymmetry in the present situation. While carefully restraining itself from taking explicit positions on questions of public policy, the university is implicitly and sometimes indirectly involved in a number of activities which have the net effect of maintaining the status quo. Therefore, while we express no opinion on the substantive issues, we shall later make suggestions for greatly increasing discussion of these issues within the university community and for machinery to broaden the base for decision making in this area.

Closely intertwined with the way the university may influence society is the reciprocal question - How does society affect decision making in the university? The most important outside influence on university decision making is the fact that everyone connected with the university very largely shares the cultural values of the rest of society. These values are, therefore, directly reflected in university decision making. For example, the national manpower market is an influence on the university if only because mobile faculty members share the socio-economic values of the rest of society which lead them to be influenced by such a market. This sharing of society's current values doubtless prevents the university from being as much of an innovative force as it might otherwise be. Nevertheless, this sharing of current values is not complete, and on balance the faculties of universities appear to have been somewhat more progressive than the rest of society during most of this century.

American universities have tried to protect themselves against the more recognizable forms of undue influence, either from official legislative bodies or private donors in a variety of ways.

A Board of Trustees or Regents is interposed between the source of support and the faculty; various protections are written into charters and by-laws; regional and national associations have developed numerous ways of protecting individual institutions against undue pressures. In addition to these legal and structural protections, universities have worked hard to develop multiple sources of support so that they need not be unduly beholden to any one of them. This philosophy is well understood by the donors as well as the recipients. Indeed, when the federal government undertook substantially to support research and higher education after World War II, the policy was explicitly followed by channeling this support through a multiplicity of government agencies.

In the opinion of most university administrators and faculty, the "pluralistic" system of support has worked well. In recent years, American science and scholarship has undergone a truly astonishing development so that the United States is now the acknowledged leader in almost all fields of learning and technology. Few investigators have felt under serious pressure in their choice of research projects from those in charge of the distribution of either government or industrial funds. Although much of such support is earmarked for specific purposes, these purposes are so varied that the individual investigator has almost always been able to find some agency that could support any competent and significant piece of research in the natural sciences and to a large extent in the social sciences as well. Indeed, in most universities, virtually the entire research budget in the natural sciences is provided from federal and industrial sources, and the total of these monies frequently comes to over half of the total expenditures of a given institution.

Admittedly, outside support for the humanities has been much harder to come by, and the disproportionate development of the sciences in most universities can be taken as evidence that public attitudes and values do indeed have a direct effect on the course of affiars within the university. Most universities have attempted to balance the situation by channeling their "free funds" to those areas unfavored by government or foundation support. That these efforts have been generally successful is attested to by the interesting but not widely recognized fact that the percentage of students enrolled in the various disciplinary areas has changed very little in response to the enormous increase in government support for the sciences.

Two things have happened recently to cast some shadows on this scene. The first is a general tightening of government funds. The reduction in total funds available has been felt by all investigators. Furthermore, almost all government agencies have been told to stick more closely to their "missions" in distributing funds for research. This has made it more difficult to find support for basic research, and some investigators may have begun to feel some restriction on their free choice of research projects for this reason.

From quite a different quarter, the contention is heard that the university is far too dependent on federal, industrial and foundation funds and has in effect become a part of the industrial military complex. All of these sources, and most of the private individual donors as well, represent vested interests in the status quo; but it is hard to see what the alternatives are. In a way this criticism in its most general form simply says that the trouble is that universities get money from those who have it. More cogent is the contention that too high a percentage of support comes from the military. Indeed it is hard to argue otherwise in the face of the fact that the Department of Defense is the largest single source of Federal money on the Cornell Campus. Some of the more extreme criticisms imply, however, that a university compromises itself by accepting research money for any purpose from a military service. A related point of view holds that to work on projects of probable military importance implies university approval of military policy in general and of the specific war or wars in which the new knowledge or technology is to be applied.

The more usual point of view on this matter recognizes that under modern conditions, the common defense requires the participation of almost all elements in society. The university as the principal source of new technologies and trained manpower, is in this sense an essential element in the defense establishment. On the other hand, it is not part of the university's business to decide how or when these technologies and manpower are to be used, or to pass judgment as an institution on the justness of particular wars.

This policy of detachment does not imply, however, that such topics are not suitable for academic debate. Furthermore, individual faculty members are free to take public positions on questions of military policy and to participate as consultants to official agencies responsible for making foreign policy and military decisions. Indeed, it can be argued that university people may be in a better position to exert a moderating influence on military thought if they have become familiar with strategic and technological matters in a consulting capacity. The recent informed testimony of many university scholars against deploying the ABM system is a case in point.

Finally, although the university does recognize a responsibility to participate in national preparedness by providing training in foreign languages, for example, or by doing research which may contribute to the perfection of early warning systems, it reserves the right to limit such activities to those compatible with its primary educational function. Cornell, in company with several other leading institutions, refuses to do classified research on its campus for this reason. It may be worth noting that in making this decision, it was necessary to weigh the freedom of the individual faculty member to work on problems of his own choosing against the freedom of the student to hear about and participate in any research conducted, whether he could be "cleared" or not. An equally strong argument was found in the principle that university research should lead to knowledge which is freely available to all.

The foregoing very brief review of some of the more important transactions between the university and society is submitted merely to demonstrate that such transactions are already substantial and significant. As we have indicated above, different observers will differ sharply in their interpretation that the university is already so deeply involved in policy making for society that it is the grossest sort of hyprocrisy to deny it. The only proper course is to admit the inevitability of such involvement and take clearer, more explicit and presumably more morally justifiable positions.

At the other extreme are those who regard most or all of the started involvements as innocent of any implications of partiality. Indeed, they would turn the situation around and say that the protection of the university's traditional stance of impartiality *requires* that on-campus facilities be made available to Dow Chemical. Still others may be considerably embarrassed by the charge that some universities are deeply involved in some of the less savory aspects of military research or with a kind of industrial research which may be interpreted as an endorsement of the products of a particular firm. Far from regarding these unhappy facts as an argument for further involvement in society's decisions, they would plead for a planned withdrawal from all work of this character. In order to carry this argument to a symmetrical conclusion, the university would then have to withdraw from many other activities of an apparently more benign character.

Variants of these three positions are represented on the Commission, but its members are in substantial agreement that much of the university's involvement in society has grown more or less automatically and with inadequate attention to some of the basic issues involved. Many members of the community are actually unaware of the extent of the involvement. Many more are insufficiently versed both in the theoretical principles governing decisions in this area or of the way the various situations work out in practice.

Similarly, the growth of support through outside grants and federal agencies, including the military, has grown by a series of largely individual decisions. Individual faculty members aware of the availability of funds for the investigations of particular topics have filled out applications, discussed these briefly with their dean and sent them off to the agency for approval. As this practice became more and more widespread, the university developed a special office for helping prepare the applications and seeing that they were in general accord with university policy. The faculty as a whole and the Board of Trustees were, in general, aware of the growing support from outside sources and were in general pleased to have this contribution to the budget. Only very occasionally were matters of overall policy considered by the faculty as a whole and ultimately by the board, as in the case of the decision not to do classified research on the campus. More recently, a good deal of faculty discussion preceeded the adoption of a set of rules governing the use of human beings as subjects for teaching and research.

The use of on-campus facilities by outside organizations has usually been arranged through administrative decision, although the faculty and trustees have from time to time indicated their approval of a policy which makes these facilities available without regard to race, creed, color,or political affiliation. Matters involving the investment of university funds have until very recently been left almost wholly to the Board of Trustees, and indeed the very thought that such funds might be used to accomplish a particular political or social end, other than the support of the university, has scarcely been an issue. On the other hand, it seems highly probable that the investment committee of the Board has taken into consideration questions of propriety in arranging the investment portfolio.

In short, it may be said that the university's involvement with the community has grown up as the result of a series of pragmatic responses to special situations. This lack of clearly thought out and carefully explained policy leaves the the university open to charges of hyprocrisy, bad faith, and complicity with the hated industrial military complex. Only when one understands the intensity with which these charges are felt by important segments of the academic community can one explain the increasing hostility to the university expressed in both words and deeds. At the very least, it can be said that the time has come when the university and its constituencies must become more conscious of what its relations with the community are and how its decisions in this regard are made.

I. B. THE FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE APPARATUS

University administration is a complex of functions and activities designed to be supportive of the central educational and research goals of the University. It is convenient to divide it into three parts. One is the academic administration which consists principally of the academic deans, the department chairman and their staffs. A second part is the central administration which consists of the Office of the President and the group of Vice Presidents, registrars, financial officers and similar officers which report to the President. The third part is the group of auxiliary enterprises which are not academic and yet which are to some degree independent of direct responsibiliy to the President, more often reporting to some Vice President.

An important characteristic of university administrations is that they are widely decentralized.* Administrative responsibility is shared by a complex interlocking group of faculty committees, student-faculty committees, deans, department chairmen, departmental committees, college committees, central administrators, mixed administrative faculty committees, and so forth. Much of this decentralization responds to the fundamental fact that decisions on academic problems should primarily be in the hands of faculty. Some of the complexity arises from the fact that these decisions often interact importantly with financial decisions which are most commonly dealt with by the central administration. Needless to say, there are complicated problems of overlap, non-interacting bureaucracies, etc.

1. The Academic Administration

The academic administration is responsible for all of the central aspects of the academic program. This involves development of curriculum, decisions about major, minor and other academic requirements, recommendations of candidates for degrees, and decisions about the hiring and the promotion of new staff. The initial decision-making, which is the significant part, is normally done by departments and the colleges. The more significant of these decisions may later be reviewed and ratified by the central administration and formally acted on by the Trustees.

Very substantial powers reside in the hands of the departments and are formally exercised by the departmental chairman and the various departmental committees. These groups normally make decisions about staff hiring and staff promotions, develop curricula within the broad college boundary lines, assign teaching loads, make decisions about use of space within the buildings or portions of buildings assigned to the department, etc. The department chairman negotiates his budget with the college dean and presents his case for changes to the dean for his consideration. In a formal sense, the departments, specifically the department chairmen, have responsibility for the research activities of the department faculty also, but this responsibility is not always fully accepted. Traditionally, the choice of research problems and the way they are conducted, as well as their financing, are left largely in the hands of the individual professor.

---

* Jencks and Riesman, The Academic Revolution (Doubleday), passim.

The office of the college dean, working with a group of college committees, makes college decisions on budget and on requirements for admission, for graduation, and so on. Commonly, although not invariably, admission is in the hands of the colleges also.

Sometimes college responsibility stops at the undergraduate level. More commonly, departments and colleges assume responsibility for graduate as well as undergraduate teaching. More recently responsibility for post-doctoral training has been added. In a sense this full assumption of responsibility is useful and perhaps in many ways essential. However, it is sometimes complicated by the fact that the alignment of faculty for graduate training does not always follow precise departmental lines.

Since the college and departmental structure leads to a rather rigid organization it is sometimes necessary to introduce variance to permit response to interdisciplinary needs of one sort or another. Thus, one finds within colleges such interdisciplinary components as Programs and Institutes. Between colleges, similar interdisciplinary programs are often called Centers.

To be a college dean or an assistant dean or to be department chairman of large departments is essentially a full-time job. However, it is typical of people who have these positions that they think of the administrative assignment as temporary and usually plan to return to their academic role after five or ten years of administration. Sometimes this actually happens.

2. The Central University Administration

Rapid growth in the size and importance of the central administration of universities is a world-wide characteristic. Partly this growth is in response to the very considerably increased size, complexity and financial activity of the modern university. It also reflects the fact that efficiency often dictates that certain jobs be handled on a university-wide basis.

Examples are the university library, the university central computer, the maintenance of buildings and property, the central purchasing office, etc. Within the central administration are also to be found another set of academic-related tasks which are appropriately centralized; these include such activities as the university registrar, a department of planning, offices for fellowship awards, the treasurers office, etc.

The Office of the University President, along with the associated vice presidents, has grown to be of major importance in the American university. Partly this is a reflection of the very size of the administrative operations which requires a substantial administrative effort to keep things going. Partly it reflects the highly complicated circumstances in which a modern university exists, with funds coming from such varied sources as federal and state governments, foundations, alumni, industry, etc., and with numerous sorts of public service activities linking the university to the outside world. Of perhaps equal importance, however, is the fact that the central administration in the person of the President is the component of the university that deals directly with the Board of Trustees. Although normal academic affairs are in the hands of the colleges, the fact that the President usually has independent funds available directly to him and in addition has easy access to foundations and industry, enables his office to be a significant force for innovation and change in a university. Over a modest number of years, a President has it in his power substantially to build up one segment of the university and significantly to slow down the development of another. Purposeful central administrations can make very considerable differences in universities as witness the marked accelerating effect which a purposeful administration has and on the growth of Stanford University in recent years.

Because of the strongly decentralized nature of the university activities even a central administration cannot with impunity make very many decisions by itself. A successful administration works very closely with the colleges and with other faculty and student groups. In fact it is typical that substantial changes in activity of readjustments of policies will be taken, perhaps with initial initiative from the President, by mixed faculty-student administration committees or commissions charged for the purpose. This complex but essential set of continued interactions between the various parts of the university and especially between purely administrative and purely academic parts is an essential feature of university administration.

3. The Auxiliary Administrators

It is not uncommon in universities that there will be significant offices within the universities which under most circumstances operate in a more or less independent way, reporting formally to some component of administration, but carrying along in a quasi-independent way if things go well. A very clear example is the University Press. Other examples are university stores and such separately endowed entities as, for example, Cornell Plantations.

Of particular importance in that their interactions with students are continuing and occasionally exacerbating, are the administrative entities which deal directly with students, e.g., the Dean of Students' Offices and the Safety Division, and those which cater to student needs as for example the administration of housing and dining, student union buildings, etc. Typically these units report to central administration but in view of their close coupling with the student life it is not uncommon that student or student-faculty committees are closely linked to them to permit student and faculty views to be available to these service groups.

4. The Role of Trustees

In a legal sense, virtually all the decisions we have been discussing, academic, residential, and those involving general policy, are made by the trustees. The Board of Trustees, again in a legal sense, owns the University, makes or at least ratifies all the major appointments to its staff, raises and administers the funds, and approves the budgets. Those things which it does not vote on itself, it delegates to the President and his executive apparatus or to the President and the faculties. In a formal sense then, all the power of the University is in the hands of the Trustees. This occasionally leads to the conclusion that those who wish to influence University policy should make every effort to be represented directly on this Board.

In actual practice, the situation is quite different. In the first place, the Board works very closely with the President and as long as it has confidence in him, it almost invariably accepts his formal recommendation? From time to time, however, individual members of the Board may informally and outside of the meeting, try to influence his decisions. In most cases, shortly after a board loses confidence in its president, the president either quietly or conspicuously resigns; the board then sets about what is by far its most important task, the appointment of a new president. Indeed, a great deal of its activity between these climactic moments may be thought of as primarily a process of educating and preparing the board to deal with such emergencies.

In matters of educational policy, including the appointment of major professors, a university board of trustees almost invariably follows the recommendations of its president and deans. It may frequently discuss in a rather lengthy way questions of overall policy such as the number of school or subject areas to be represented, admissions policy, or the university's policy towards fraternities. The vigor of the questioning and the degree of information and wisdom revealed by the questions may be a very important guide to the President as to how rapidly he can bring in proposals for change. In this way, a good board may exert far more influence than would appear to the casual visitor at meetings or to one who merely goes through the minutes and observes that virtually every recommendation has been approved unanimously.

In perhaps only one area does the Board exercise a degree of initiative considerably greater than that exercised by the faculty or the administrative apparatus; this is in the general area of finance. Here the Board usually functions through a subcommittee responsible for the investment policy and for such matters as the purchase of land for future academic use. Other important subcommittees deal with the raising of new funds and the board of trustees of most universities is a primary source of money for maintenance, endowment, and new buildings. Through its own contributions and the control of the budget, it is common for a university board to exercise a good deal of influence on the scheduling of new buildings, and thus indirectly on research and educational policy.

Another very important function of a board, perhaps the paramount one next to the appointment of a new president, is its role as the interpreter of the university to the community and conversely in bringing certain community needs to the attention of the university. In State Universities, the opinions of individual regents can be decisive in influencing the legislature in such matters as the size of appropriations or the degree to which the legislature will concern itself in the hiring or dismissal of faculty with controversial political views. The boards of private institutions play a similar but less formal role in reassuring influential friends that academic freedom is a good thing and that the decisions to protect certain controversial professors were indeed the right ones.

Although boards of trustees and Regents vary in quality and their devotion, it appears that in the great majority of cases this unique feature of the American University has served to protect it from political and social forces inimical to Academic freedom and educational innovation. Although we who are concerned with reform are acutely aware of the defects of the American university, the fact remains that it has been far freer from political interference and at the same time far more responsive to social needs than its counterparts on the other four major continents.

It would appear then, that the role of most university boards of trustees is quite different from those of the faculty and students to whom it delegates large areas of authority. Indeed, there is some reason to suppose that the day to day operations of the university on the one hand and the proceedings of the board of trustees on the other, proceed more smoothly if conducted in relative isolation from one another than they would if efforts were made to bring them closer together. Experience seems to show, for example, that a single channel of communication between a board and the managerial apparatus for which it is responsible is preferable to a number of competing channels. It is for this reason that the president, who is at the top of the managerial apparatus, is also usually a member of the board. It is up to him to present a balanced view of the organization's needs to the board and for the board to express their views through him to the rest of the university community. In the view of the chairman of the Commission, the question of whether the faculty or student body should have some sort of representation on the Board of Trustees is a matter of no great consequence one way or the other, but it may be observed that such a mixture of functions may have a tendency to fuzz up the otherwise clear orderly lines of communication between the Board and the other constituencies of the University. In theory at least the President is in a better position to present a balanced view of the University's needs than are individual faculty members or students whose ties and loyalties are necessarily greater to some parts of the University than to others. It can also be argued that the presence of students and faculty might stimulate the board to go into detailed consideration of academic or disciplinary matters which might otherwise remain delegated more completely to students and faculty by themselves.

On the other hand, faculty and student members can serve to reassure their constituencies that the Trustees are in fact devoted to the University and are not engaged in covert opposition to student or faculty welfare. Some institutions have found it useful to encourage informal meetings among Trustees and substantial numbers of faculty and students for discussion of specific problems. Such meetings usually have the additional effect of establishing a better sense of personal rapport and mutual respect among the various constituencies.

It must be pointed out that faculty and students sometimes have occasion to resent the fact that the Board of Trustees reserve certain powers for themselves. In recent years for example the Cornell Board has certainly been slower than many faculty and students would like to implement the resolution that the University "disengage" itself from the fraternity system. Another group of faculty has certainly disagreed rather sharpely with the decision to sell the Cornell Aeronautical laboratory to a profit making conglomerate; still others are concerned with the ambiguity still surrounding the investment policy.

The Commission never came fully to grips with these questions. If it had, it is unlikely that it could have reached anything like a consensus. Certainly there is a substantial opinion both on the Commission and elsewhere that students and faculty are insufficiently represented on the board itself. Indeed there are those who feel that boards of trustees are irrelevant and that the sovereignty of the University should reside entirely in the faculty and students since they are the primary parties at interest and have a better idea of what a University is all about.

To others, the latter view gives too little weight to the interests of various large unseen constituencies--the alumni and society at large. It may also be objected that the presence of students and faculty on the board involves a conflict of interest in that they would be serving simultaneously as judges and advocates. This argument can in turn be countered by pointing to certain large corporations governed by boards drawn almost wholly from their full time employees. The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey is an outstanding example.

Another approach to the problem may be found in the fact that most of the instances of board decisions which arouse student and faculty criticism involve matters on which student and faculty opinion is by no means unanimous. Indeed all three of the cases mentioned above involve sharp differences of opinion within every one of the University constituencies. Any decision is therefore bound to arouse hostility and it may be just as well to direct this hostility towards a somewhat remote board rather than retaining it within the campus community to act as a continuous source of irritation among individuals who must work comfortably with one another in many other ways.

Finally it must be recognized that most of the critical decisions of the board involve either the acquisition or commitment of money. Not only are faculty and students notably inexperienced in financial matters, they are usually not in good position to shoulder a continuing responsibility for meeting financial commitments.

Perhaps enough has been said to indicate the complexities facing those who would undertake a restructuring of the current relationship between the board and other elements within the University. It is far easier to get agreement on the proposition that most universities boards are overweighted with relatively conservative members of the world of affairs especially business and the law. Scholars from other institutions, representatives of the performing and creative arts, labor, women, blacks and other minorities are all usually non-existent or seriously underrepresented. Cornell's usually large Board with a high proportion of ex-officio members from various walks of life is perhaps more broadly representative than most, although still vulnerable to the criticism that it is heavily weighted on the side of the status quo. As vacancies become available, the addition of a number of people with academic experience in other institutions might serve to broaden and liberalize the board without incurring some of the disadvantages of adding local faculty outlined above.

I. C. THE STUDENT AND HIS DISCONTENTS

The Commission attempted to take a broad view of its charge to consider possible changes in the governance of universities. This report has begun therefore with a brief review of the three principal functions of a university, and we endeavored to keep these three functions before us at all times. Nevertheless, we were conscious that the appointment of the commission was primarily prompted by the breakdown of student government at Cornell, and that this breakdown was in turn traceable to world wide student dissatisfaction with universities as they are and with the role of students in their governance. We have therefore given special attention to the student and his discontents. Another way of putting it, is to say, we spent a great deal of time analyzing the discontented student. We recognize that the actively discontented student is in the minority, and that the violently discontented constitute a tiny minority. Nevertheless, it is manifestly unwise to dismiss either a point of view or a political movement merely because it is for the time being supported by relatively few people. All new movements are started by active minorities, who may very well consciously express the unconscious sources of majority dissatisfaction.

Furthermore, some of the things the minority is saying today have an uncomfortable quality for all but the most complacent defenders of current ideas and practices. In a word, they raise questions about the nature of man and society which no society ever solves completely. Every so often we have to take our basic assumptions out from the sealed vaults of our minds and look at them again. This may well be one of those times. As Arthur Schlesinger puts it in a recent article "The industrial order is undergoing vast and fundamental changes as the mechanical society created by the first industrial revolution is evolving into the new electronic society. 'Because your country is further on the path of industrial development than ours,' Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber told a meeting of American intellectuals, 'many of the crises you are living through today are the ones we shall increasingly have to face in the future.' If America is in a turmoil, he continued, this was not the proof of decay but the price of progress. America seems in crisis because Americans have reached a point of social transformation where they are raising and debating fundamental questions long buried in tradition and dogma: the relationships between rich and poor, between black and white, between parent and child, between structure and spontaneity. 'From the answers that you will find to this new set of questions will come a new 'social contract,' a new definition of the relationship between man and society with this second industrial revolution.'"*

Much of student unease seems to focus on the conflict between "structure and spontaneity." Feeling their own spontaneity confined by a number of tangible and intangible restraints they tend to attribute a degree both of power and rigidity to certain social structures which seems wholly unwarranted to those who have learned to live not too uncomfortably with the existing system, power structure, or decision making apparatus.

In its simplest form, the belief in the reality of a power structure in the university implies the acceptance of an administrative diagram which shows power flowing down from the trustees through the president to the faculty, with nothing left for distribution to the lowly students. Decisions are thought of as being made at single points in time and space within this system. With such a diagram in mind, nothing seems more obvious to those who would change the way the system works than the desirability of being represented at the decision points.

The more we looked at how things actually take place in the university, the more inadequate the above diagram appeared to be. The university with its multiplicity of functions is like no other organization in modern society. As a result, analogies with other sorts of administration apparatus are of limited utility. It is like a corporation in having a board, a president, and employees. It is like a military garrison or a monastery in having a 24 hour rather than 8 hour per day relationship with much of its membership, but it is very unlike these institutions in other ways. It is like a Venetian oligarchy in the power of its faculty to regulate purely academic matters, but a totally different and much more restricted autocracy handles its financing.

Approaching this far from monolithic structure from the point of view of the student and his discontents, we found it productive to consider dividing our analyses and our recommendations under three different headings:

1. The quality of his life as a member of the university community.
2. The quality of his educational experience in a strictly academic sense.
3. His relationship to the university as a concerned citizen.

---

* Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. "Vietnam and the End of the Age of the Superpowers," Harper's Magazine, Vol. 238, No. 1426, March 1969 pp. 41-49.

All three are of course closely related to one another, but the interplay between "structure and spontaneity" is quite different in each case.

Nowhere is it more confusing and contradictory than in the student's relationship with the University Community. Indeed, at a very early stage of our deliberations one of our most sensitive and insightful members showed us what we were up against when she remarked that the present day student is caught in an unresolvable paradox. "On the one hand he complains of anomie and longs to be a member of a coherent supportive community. On the other he is explicitly anarchic, and demands a right to express himself completely spontaneously without any structural restraints."

Let us begin, then, with a consideration of the university as a community in which the student is seeking some sort of effective and personally satisfying membership.

1. The Encounter with the Community*

Student unrest is not simply a revolt against an existing order: it is in large part a quest for a sense of community. One of the interesting characteristics of student sit-ins or protests is the dialogue, opportunity to speak, communal effort, and a sense of community that develops. As Paul Goodman says:

> So, describing radical students--and I do not know how many others--we have noticed their solidarity based on community rather than ideology, their style of direct and frank confrontation, their democratic inclusiveness and aristocratic carelessness of status, caste or getting ahead, their selectivity of the affluent standard of living, their effort to be authentic and committed to their causes rather than merely belonging, their determination to have a say and their refusal to be processed as standard items, their extreme distrust of topdown direction, their disposition to anarchist organization and direct action, their disillusion with the system of institutions, and their belief that they can carry on major social functions in improvised parallel organizations.

One senses in this description the quest for instant status in the spontaneity and egalitarian climate of the small crowd.

---

*Written by David Moore with help from Sarah Diamant.

Irving Horowitz and William Friedland comment similarly in their study of the sit-in at Stanford University last year (as yet unpublished). They describe student rebels and no doubt other students as "linked directly to the romantic concerns of the young, where the essential qualities of student life: individual expression, minimal emphasis on efficiency, and maximization of spontaneity and direct action are now of crucial importance." The seminars which developed during the sit-in highlight the students' desire for interpersonal relations, discussions, an opportunity to talk, to think big, to think and, above all, feel with others.

Note how this need for interpersonal relations and identity with the crown contrasts with the highly individual performances of the successful professorial prototype who generally lives a somewhat detached life in quiet competition with his associates. When he comes together with his colleagues to make decisions, the relationships are generally formal and regulated by parliamentary procedures and majority vote rather than by spontaneous dialogue and consensus.

The Academic Community

Against this background of the search by some students at least for a meaningful life through identity with a morality play, we can turn to an exploration of the meaning of the term academic community and its prospects of development. Strictly speaking, "community" implies a geographic or territorial dimension. A community is where people live. There was a time when Cornell was a community in this sense. This was the period when faculty and students lived together on campus or just off campus. In that day, it was proper to refer to the campus as the academic community since it was a community (or perhaps a neighborhood) in the larger city involving the president of the university, faculty and their families, and students. Today, a community of students, faculty, and administrators living together in relatively close proximity and interacting one with the other in the development of a moral order no longer exists, if indeed it ever existed. Faculty and administrators, like other middle-class urbanites, have moved to suburbia. There is an interesting parallel between the abandoned campus and the abandoned central city. Like the central city, the campus is simply a place of work to the professor. He comes to work at 8:00 a.m. or later and leaves at 5:30 p.m. or earlier. Occasionally, he comes back for a concert, lecture, ball game, or reception at the White Art Museum. Otherwise, after five, the campus is left to the students. Thus, the student is given no actual community leadership, at least from the older generation. The esteemed professor is not there, setting some kind of example (good or bad but at least with moral implications) with his proper (or conceivably improper) wife and the campus small-fry. The stern president does not preside on the hill. The actual residential life of the faculty is no longer visible to students except as visitations are arranged during freshman orientation week, and this has about as much impact as a trip to the zoo.

By the same token, most professors and administrators no longer feel the influence of student life as a normal part of their residential existence. One doesn't walk out on the street and run into students. Indeed, if one did, one might start worrying about students "invading" the residential areas, particularly if they appeared in large numbers. Somehow, one expects that students will stay on the compound except for weekend expeditions downtown or better still out-of-town. Thus, professors live for the most part like suburbanites everywhere separated from the world of work and from the people upon whom they really depend and who in turn depend on them.

Professors meet students for the most part only under highly structured circumstances in the classroom, in their offices, and occasionally at coffees or teas. Administrators have largely limited their contacts to ceremonial events, occasional social events, committees, and confrontations. Both professors and administrators accordingly are viewed more frequently in their formal authoritarian roles. Even the friendliest of them have difficulty overcoming the distance and the formality.

The fact that the university is a place of work for professors also creates an attitude toward students which militates against the development of informal dialogue and more intimate relationships. The professor is at the university to work which means reading, note-taking, organizing research, instructing research assistants and clerical employees, raising research funds, setting up field sites for research, writing lecture notes and manuscripts for publication, and occasionally leaving the office to enter a lecture hall or seminar room to meet with the students. He may value students very highly in the classroom, but elsewhere their value diminishes.

The number of students who could make claims on the time of the professor or administrator is overwhelming. The professor, for example, with 15 advisees, five graduate students, and two classes of 40 students each has a total of 100 persons who might have very legitimate reasons for asking for personal attention. The administrator is in even worse shape. The dean is confronted not only by all the students in his college but his entire faculty and key staff. As one moves up the line, personal, informal relationships become impossible. Under such circumstances, the vision of faculty, students, and administrators engaged in a "search for truth" in a relationship of informal intimacy and dialogue just doesn't square with reality of the situation. At best, it might be staged in Barton Hall or Schoellkopf Field with bull horns.

For all these reasons and perhaps others, the relationship between faculty and administrators and students is formal and distant. Peer group relations on both sides are enhanced.

Even for students who at least live there, the campus is not strictly a community in the sense that they regard it as the place in which they live. Actually, their homes (at least until they become graduate students) are elsewhere. They live in Manhasset but they go to school at Cornell. Thus, residential life for the undergraduate is a temporary existence which may be very important to him for nine months out of the year but which is nonetheless temporary. It's like putting in time at any institution--a prison, a tuberculosis sanitarium, or an army camp. Peer group relations are important; there are some pleasures and lots of annoyances; you might even try to do something about the community, but this is more often an expression of collective behavior or an exercise in political action than a genuine interest in doing something about one's home town.

What we are saying is that it would be extremely difficult to build a community anywhere of persons who regard themselves as temporary visitors, stay only part of the year, and at best stay on only four years. Once the professors move out, the campus becomes a work organization for them and a temporary encampment for students.

Any effort to impose a community-like political and social structure on the entire residential campus will be artificial. This is not to imply that social groups will not develop. They will and we shall speak of these later. We are, however, referring to the organizing of the lives of faculty and students as though a residential community existed. This can be achieved only if the basis for community life exists naturally. As it is now, the faculty really couldn't care less except in an intellectural sense about the residential community of the students any more than they could care about the V.F.W. convention as long as it is confined to an area away from the professor's own residential community. Moreover, students are too temporary and uncommitted to provide a strong base for community organization.

In a town like Yellow Springs, Ohio, a community organization might be workable because the makings of a community may already exist. Under such circumstances, the permanent residents--administrators, faculty, staff, and townsfolk--can add an element of stability and counterbalance to the somewhat more experimental moods of temporary, uncommitted residents like students. By the same token, the students can jar the status quo and move the entire community to innovate and try something new.

Where natural residential communities don't exist, the most likely organization is the managed community. It probably doesn't really matter who control the managed community as long as things are handled efficiently and for the good of the largest number. It is, however, well to keep in mind that managing a residential community requires some skill and knowledge. Cornell has a School of Hotel Administration which currently takes four years to train managers for hotels. An entire community imposes even greater problems. Even if students took over the top policy-making positions, there would still be a need for a permanent bureaucracy to see that complex activities of the community were handled. Nothing actually would change.

All that is left then is the regulation of personal behavior in one's place of residence in order to accommodate the rights and privileges of one's neighbors. The Sindler Commission has already given this task to students where it properly belongs since they have the most to lose from inconsiderate neighbors.

Key points thus far are as follows:

1. To sociologists, the idea of community involves geographic location.
2. The academic community does not include presidents, deans, or faculty as residents. They live away from the campus.
3. Only the students are left to a kind of ghetto existence in the abandoned central city without permanent leadership and relying on peer group relationships.
4. The administration and faculty leave students in the hands of baby-sitters (residential counselors).
5. To the student, the residential arrangement, while important to him, is temporary. It is temporary in a psychological sense in that he thinks of home as where his parents live. It is temporary in the physical sense that he spends only part of the year on campus

and expects at best to come back each year (like an extended summer camp) for four years.
6. This is not the stuff out of which stable community life develops. Social and peer group relations develop but not community.
7. It is artificial to impose the political and social structure of a "natural" town on a temporary, continuously changing population like this one. Most couldn't care less. It would be like trying to create a viable community in an army barracks. It might be an interesting political and social exercise for a while, but without natural interest, it would soon die.
8. It may survive in Antioch because administrators, faculty, and townsfolk are members of the community organization. If it were to work in Ithaca, a political subdivision including most faculty and students needs to be carved from the present city of Ithaca and surrounding villages. Or else, administrators and faculty need to move back to the campus and immediate surrounding area.
9. Barring a natural community, a managed community most likely would develop. It matters little who presumes to set policy for the managed community. It has a job to do requiring a permanent bureaucracy. Nothing would change with a change in management.
10. We are finally reduced to a consideration of the regulation of personal behavior. Under present circumstances, since students are the only ones living on the campus, such regulations properly belongs to them.

Small Groups and Student Identification

The lack of "natural" conditions for the development of residential community life in an ordinary sense does not prevent the development of various social groups among students. There are, in fact, many opportunities for them to identify with small groups or organizations--fraternities, schools and colleges, clubs, action-groups of one kind or another, and informal bull-sessions, drinking clubs, and what have you. This sort of social organization has been characteristic of college campuses for centuries and perhaps bears on questions raised by students regarding the relative advantage of small groups of concerned students compared with large, formally organized representative student governments.

What characterizes the modern campus is the breakdown in the status system around which student groups have been loosely organized in the past. The breakdown is very likely related to the greatly increased opportunities for education at the college level and the academic revolution with its emphasis on merit rather than social and economic position. Students can today ask the question, why am I attending college, and the answer isn't always clear. The idea of attending college as an instrumental step in achieving occupational success may not be very appealing to those who seek to differentiate themselves from others. It used to be, according to Jencks and Riesman, that "many if not most undergraduates came to the old special-interest colleges in order to kill time, get away from home, make new friends, enjoy themselves, acquire salable skills, and so forth." This pattern has long since been rejected by the professional faculty which is in the driver's seat in most universities.

Students themselves no longer view a college education, especially at the undergraduate level, as particularly distinctive. The search for new meaning, therefore, goes on. Without intrinsic social value, suddenly much of the subject-matter of a college education seems dreary and unimportant. It was dreary before, but no one paid any attention. If one cannot accept the idea that college education is somehow important to one's future career and opportunities or one's social standing, then there are few alternatives. You can argue that there is intrinsic value in knowledge, intrinsic value in beauty, intrinsic value in rationality, civility, refinement, you name it. But meaning must be derived from more solid stuff than this. If all else fails, you can look for meaning in social service, doing something to make this a better world, building a university which is devoted to humanity.

Current trends in these directions in the university community reflect deeper trends in the broader society. Already, we are talking about the post-industrial society which will be something quite different from the industrial society of the past 100 years. We have moved from a production-oriented society to a market-oriented one. As the role of the consumer assumes even more significance in our society and is viewed as an active rather than a passive role, there will be increasing emphasis on humanism and the development of the individual to his fullest capacities not just as a worker (since this will be decreasingly significant) but as a consumer or, to put it another way, as a person with interests and activities of his own.

What about the relative advantages of large-scale representative student governments versus small groups of concerned students? Students have traditionally organized most effectively in small groups. The larger structure of relationships has been loosely organized around an informal status system involving colleges, fraternities, clubs, and so on. If this rather flimsy, informal structure breaks down, then the likelihood of acceptance of more formal structures like student government seem rather unlikely. This leaves, therefore, only the small group structure.

The university faculty or administration has not been particularly helpful in the face of the changes that have been occurring. It has lent its prestige to the breaking up of the old structure but has not done very much about fostering a new system of status that will bring some order out of the chaos.

Summary of key points in this section is, as follows:

1. Students seem to organize most naturally into small groups, some formally structured like fraternities and residential clubs but more of an informal variety.
2. In the past, the sub-structure of student life was loosely bound together by a status structure that reflected the existing meaning of campus life.
3. The meaning of college has been shaken by the democratization of opportunities for higher education and the professionalization of the faculty which places greater emphasis on merit than social and economic considerations. The success of the faculty has drastically altered the role of the university in our society.
4. With this loss of meaning, the campus status structure has been breaking up with no new status structure to take its place.
5. Lack of meaning has resulted in considerable malaise among students who view their studies with uncertainty and wonder about its relevance to an unknown future.
6. Humanistic concerns seem like a natural next step in the development of our post-industrial society. Many thoughtful students have focused attention on issues of social and humanistic significance.

Community of Scholars

There is still another sense in which the term academic community has been used and that is in the sense of the mystical communion that emerges among scholars with the same standards of rationality and the same commitment to the pursuit of truth. Robert Maynard Hutchins used to refer to the "community of scholars" bound together by common language, common cultural past, common logic, and common commitment to the pursuit of truth and beauty. The model is of course the monastic community; and, interestingly enough in this secular age, there are some characteristics of the monastery still to be found in the modern university--the solitary pursuits of the professor, his frequent lack of concern with material things, the colleague relationships, the priestly robes and pageantry, and so on. These are relics, yet they still have appeal.

But there are considerations that are far more important than these that bind the faculty. When university presidents and others refer to the academic community, they are seeking a term which implies something less authoritarian and more loosely structured and diffuse than a hierarchial organization. No one ever refers, for example, to Cornell as a corporation or to professors as employees of the corporation. The implications are entirely too painful, nor are they quite accurate.

A university is to be sure a corporation, but the academic staff which it employs is a strongly organized professional group which has a major say in regard to what is taught, what is researched, who is taught, who is certified, and what standards of conduct will prevail. The strength of the organization may vary from campus to campus, but the most prestigious universities are characterized by the strongest faculty organizations.

There can be little doubt that the faculty shares important values which bind it together. Actually, this bond is very little different from what develops in any of the esteemed professions or, for that matter, the skilled trades. The most important of the shared values are essentially protective. You cannot arouse many professors on the positive issues of truth, beauty, or service to humanity, but you can stir up a hornet's nest if you threaten them with the loss of status, loss of freedom of speech, or loss of job tenure. Furthermore, you can create an enormous stir if you interfere with the professor's "inalienable" right to pick his own research topics and develop his own course materials. As a group, the faculty will resist efforts by outsiders to impose curricula or alter existing disciplinary structures, i.e., departmental organizations.

The faculty, therefore, has a highly developed defensive organization which is supported and reinforced at least publicly by the administration. But it is not otherwise characterized either by a common purpose or by a sense of community. In fact, most universities are rather distinguished by highly dispersed activities individualistic, almost idiosyncratic pursuits and competition rather than cooperation. This is not a community of scholars working together to build the City of God. It is a collection of mobile, highly competitive men and women striving to achieve as individuals and worried, if they engage at all in cooperative ventures, about whose name will appear first on the title page.

Even in the fact of the most dire of emergencies when the very life of the university has been threatened, the faculty has not been outstanding in its willingness to come together in the interest of the entire community. In this respect, the faculty differs very little from other Americans who are convinced that, if everyone will only take care of his own affairs, all will be right with the world.

If one is convinced that the idea of a community of scholars is important to achieve, there are a number of approaches. One is through great educational leadership that captures the imagination of the faculty. Academic morale and community spirit sometimes develop in a new college distinguished by an exciting approach and promulgated by a charismatic educator. All great universities and colleges have had periods of such excitement often accompanied by important infusions of new money. Even where the excitement has died down, there may be residual embers admidst the ashes that can be occasionally fanned, and the flow of the primal fire sometimes attracts and warms the faculty.

Beyond charismatic leadership and exciting innovation, one is left with more mundane devices--reshaping the system of rewards and punishments to stimulate cooperative efforts and the development of new organizational structures and authority hierarchies to achieve coordination. The reshaping of the system of rewards and punishments is out since administrators are basically almost entirely in tune with the present pattern. It has been pretty well accepted in recent years that great universities are built of great professors rather than great cooperative communities. This assumption may merit examination because there is also some evidence that great communities produce great men.

Coordination through new organizational structures and authority hierarchies is a more acceptable approach at the present time. In a number of universities the job of the provost is being broken up into a collection of super-deans or associate provosts in charge of major academic divisions of the university--the social sciences, the physical sciences, the biological sciences, and so on. In this way, it is hoped that some degree of coordination can be achieved among related fields. Too often, however, this is being done soley for reasons of efficiency rather than to breathe new life into the organization.

The residential college and the decentralized college represent other structural approaches. Here, the aim is community and hopefully innovation. The effort, however, is fragmentary, creating pockets within the larger university framework that are quickly isolated and destroyed by the prevailing structure.

The use of centers or institutes represents still another structural device to achieve limited coordination. Such structures persist as long as they attract new funds. If they attract recurring funds, they become departments or schools and develop independent, more or less autonomous existences. If the funds dry up, the centers disappear. Sometimes, centers continue for long periods of time because one person or a group of persons are sufficiently interested to devote their lives to fund-raising and grantsmanship, an often thankless task.

In spite of the various structural, hierarchical and motivational devices used, however, the evidence suggests that the pattern of faculty life is the very antithesis of community if this is viewed as a human organization bound together by a sense of common purpose and coordinated, cooperative effort to achieve shared objectives. The faculty is instead distinguished by its highly individualistic performances, its live-and-let-live system of values, and its own resistance to outside interferences. There are, to be sure, pockets of cooperative endeavor but these are the exceptions rather than the rule.

At a rather low level of camaraderie, there is the usual acceptance, characteristic of all professions, of properly certified members. Still further, there is the shared admiration of spectacular, individual performances. There are also the subcultural bonds of language, ways of speaking, the styles that characterize intellectual campus life--often so subtle that those within it are hardly aware of how much they differ from outsiders. Perhaps in this sense, there is an academic community but in a very low key and hardly fulfilling the dreams of those striving for a sharply delineated identity and a clear sense of purpose.

Whether this pattern is good or bad is debatable. In a highly organized society, the openness, diversity, and freedom of the university may be a breath of fresh air like a park in a smog-bound city. But, like a public park, the naturalistic freedom of the university depends on the self-discipline of its users. The university relies on the willingness of its members to tolerate ambiguity, to live with diversity and pluralism, and to structure their own pursuits amidst an anarchy of competitive ideas and interests.

- - - - - - - -

Historically, the University community appears to have been held together by a common agreement about the right to disagree. Much of the formal administrative structure is designed to protect this right while holding the University together sufficiently to get its daily work done.

It now appears that the most "active" students and certain elements of the faculty find the University community to be failing them in two ways. In the first place, it does not fulfill their personal need to identify with an integrated society bound to a common purpose. As individuals they feel alienated and suffer from anomie. Coupled with this is a larger more general hostility to the University for failing to play a coherent reformist role in society. Finally, they identify as apathetic and indifferent all those who accept or find virtue in the traditional corporate detachment of the University from commitment to specific issues.

As pointed out earlier, however, the situation is full of paradoxes. For example, we find a certain segment of students actively seeking to destroy the existing forms and formalities which hold society together, and all this is done in the name of a greater sense of community. Even more bewildering is the snatching of microphones, the drowning out of discussions, and the actual physical removal of speakers all undertaken in the name of free speech.

But equally bewildering, perhaps, are those staunch advocates of detachment who seem to be functioning simultaneously as members of the University and as policy makers in the industrial military complex.

One way of describing the task of a Commission such as ours is as a search for organizational arrangements which will hold the University together while facilitating the resolution of paradoxes such as those described above.

First, let us turn to a consideration of the student, his current place in the decision-making apparatus, and the constraints that he feels surrounding him.

2. The Student as Decision Maker and the Feeling of Powerlessness

a. General considerations

As has been repeatedly pointed out both in this report and elsewhere (of Wallis 1965) much of the decision making in universities is decentralized and dispersed. What an individual faculty member or student does from hour to hour during the day is under his own control to a degree that would astonish the employees of an industrial establishment, the crew of a ship, of the members of a religious order. True, both students and faculty are supposed to appear at regularly assigned hours for class instruction; but both faculty and students have a wide range of choice as to what they will teach or learn, and the hours at which these activities will be carried out.

It is customary to think of this type of student decision in terms of the effects on his own life. Over time, however, the total of these decisions has profound effects on the institution. Thus, although in the past the student has had little opportunity to participate formally in faculty and administrative decisions, his own personal decisions may have effects on the institution greater than generally recognized. For example, as students turn away from majoring in physics or chemistry, the department will ask itself if it is requiring too heavy a concentration on specialized or uninteresting courses. The increasing tendency of students to work harder and take more advanced courses in high school has already had an important influence on the development of new and presumably better offerings at the college level. If more and more students elect to go into the social sciences, more and more teachers will be hired to help meet the demand, purchases for the library will be turned in this direction, and plans may be made for a new social science building.

Similarly, student preferences in regard to housing and dining influence the choice made by administrators. Many universities, for example, have slowed down dormitory building programs as students have turned more and more to private apartments. Other universities are responding with experiments in new designs for living, house plans, coeducational dormitories, and so on.

Matters of overall policy are also significantly affected by the sum of individual student decisions. Many of the major unisexual colleges have recently announced plans for becoming coeducational,in large part because of a falling off in the number of desirable students choosing to attend such institutions.

Since the decisions made by students are so important both in determining the course of their own education and in shaping the institution of which they are a part, it follows that these decisions should be as well informed and as free of artificial constraints as possible. We believe that students are not so well prepared with information and advice as they might be and we will make specific suggestions in regard to these matters in a later section.

b. The academic area

The question of constraints on student decision making in the academic area is complicated and is perceived by different observers in very different ways. These differences lie at the root of much current unrest and we shall therefore try in this section to identify the most important issues. The options open to the student are, of course, not unlimited. Some students are more conscious of constraints than others; but there is an increasing number which actively attacks these constraints as seriously inhibiting the student's academic freedom and/or his opportunity for full development. These constraints are of three kinds. The first consist of the well known rules and regulations governing the way existing courses may be taken. We shall deal with this question presently.

The second class of constraint is somewhat more subtle and difficult to deal with. A course of the kind a student wants may simply not exist, or it may be given in a way which is not meaningful to his generation. The usual criticisms heard about existing courses may be summarized as follows:

> Too many of these cover too wide an area of knowledge and are more superficial surveys.
>
> Conversely, many advanced courses are too restricted in scope and by following one aspect of a subject too deeply tend to "fragment" knowledge into meaningless bits and pieces.
>
> More existing courses are not immediately and obviously relevant to the personal, social, and political problems which trouble the student most.
>
> There is too much emphasis on knowledge for its own sake and too little attention to its "meaning" or significance.

The third constraint involves the traditionally authoritarian pattern of much teaching and learning. Ever since the student started kindergarten he has felt the need to fulfill the expectations of his teachers. This pattern is so fixed that even if the University encouraged a more adult attitude the student might find it difficult to readjust. Unfortunately, in too many instances the University merely prepetuates the old pattern and rewards the student for fulfilling the expectations set forth in prescribed reading lists, course credits and set curricula. Thus the student remains in his passive receptive state and hesitates to take command of himself.

None of these criticisms is particularly new or unusual. Indeed they have formed the principal items of the continuing agenda of educational policy and curriculum committees throughout the nation for at least a century. At Cornell they receive the special attention of the Commission on Undergraduate Education which has already made some improvements on existing offerings. Familiar though these criticisms may be, we mention them again for two reasons: a) the bearing they have on the student's power and attitudes as a decision maker in determining the course of his own education and b) because the perceived inadequacy of existing arrangements constitutes one of the strong arguments for increasing student participation in the determination of academic or educational policy.

This is not to say that all members of the Commission agree either on the seriousness of the charges or the extent to which existing arrangements can be changed without damaging other educational values of equal or perhaps greater importance. As background for future more detailed discussion of administrative matters, we will at this time mention some aspects of these academic issues in order to indicate their complexity and prepare the reader for the probability that disagreements will continue. Indeed, many of us believe that anything approaching complete agreement on matters as far-reaching as these would be a probable indication of a general enfeeblement of the academic spirit or an unhealthy acquiescence to dogmatism. Let us turn first, however, to the matter of rigidity of requirements in regard to sequencing and grouping of existing courses.

Although the American University is unique in the variety of its subject matter, the potential of choice for the student has ordinarily been restricted in various ways. These restrictions have been intended to ensure that the student receive a certain breadth of exposure to different fields of knowledge while, at the same time, going to some depth in one or possibly two "major" areas. Theoretically, the same result could be achieved under a free elective system coupled to a satisfactory group of advisors, but in practice it has proved impossible, especially in large institutions, to maintain a corps of advisors with sufficient experience, willingness and wisdom.

The situation at Cornell is difficult to characterize briefly because of the large variations among the several colleges. For example, the College of Agriculture does not have a formal system of majors and minors at all, though it does require a certain number of course credits in each of three areas (natural science, biological science, humanities and arts). Perhaps a more irksome restriction to some of these students is the requirement that at least 55[1] elective credits be taken in the College of Agriculture and not more than 20[2] in the College of Arts and Sciences. Within these fairly broad limits, the student works out his own program of specialization with his advisor, who is usually conscientious and well informed in regard to his own area of knowledge. For students whose interests fall within the total course offerings available through the college, the flexibility of these arrangements, and the reliance on advisors rather than on set requirements, appear to approach the ideal recently put forward by various progressive student groups.

It appears that the College of Engineering, on the other hand, succeeds in confining the majority of its students to a rather rigid set of curricular requirements with the great majority of courses falling squarely within the field of engineering and its very close relatives.

The College of Arts and Sciences is probably the most successful in providing its students with a broad experience, but it has managed to convey a somewhat different impression. Although for most students the number of credits used up in meeting the language and distribution requirements constitutes a relatively small fraction of the total required for graduation, the governing regulations are expressed in so complicated a way as to leave the student and sometimes his advisor with the feeling that he is caught in a pervasive bureaucratic net that leaves no room for maneuver.

---

1. This has recently been reduced to 45 plus 10 which may be taken in the other contract colleges.
2. An additional 10 credits may be taken by "exceptional" students without extra charge.

Recently, some students have called attention to the rigidity of the major field requirements. The Commission is prepared to agree that many of the major fields at Cornell require an excessive number of courses in a rather narrow area. This tendency may be an outgrowth of the fact that at Cornell major fields are in almost all instances determined on classical disciplinary lines as represented by single departments. In some cases, national associations and professional societies may have enjoined or reinforced restrictive practices.

It should be pointed out, however, that other institutions have long recognized the dangers of overspecialization at the undergraduate level and have found it possible to do something about it. For nearly half a century, for example, some of the most popular concentration areas at Harvard have been interdepartmental e.g., history, government and economics; history and literature; and the biochemical sciences. Cornell seems also to have lagged behind some other institutions in encouraging students to substitute independent study and research for a formal course requirement, especially during their third and fourth years.

In summary then, it appears that the student who wishes to design his own education at Cornell is confronted by an unnecessarily complex and apparently formidable set of requirements which vary from college to college and which, at their most stringent, may seriously interfere with acquiring a well balanced general education. At best, they require time and effort to puzzle out, and they convey an impression of arbitrariness that may tend to inhibit the development of a sense of individual responsibility for one's own intellectual life. On the other hand, it must be said that a really enterprising student with a clear idea of what he wants to do can probably arrange a suitable sequence of courses by combining an extensive knowledge of the regulations with the energy and initiative to obtain the required signatures and file the necessary petitions.

The above situation is subject to a number of interpretations and attitudes. At one extreme are those who would regard the overcoming of difficulties of this kind as a character-building exercise providing excellent preparation for life in an increasingly complex and not always sympathetic world. On the other are those who feel that this network of arbitrary regulations in the academic sphere combines with certain other restraints on the student's personal life to sap all personal initiative and sense of responsibility, thus, in effect, reducing him to the status of a house slave.

Although both of these extreme opinions are in fact represented on this Commission a reasonable middle position might be that, taken all together, the various sets of regulations, while scarcely as oppresive as sometimes represented, do indeed place unnecessary difficulties in the way of many, if not most, students and that the lost time and wasted opportunities of the many are not sufficiently compensated by the theoretical improvement in character achieved by those who manage to triumph over the system. It may, however, be noted with satisfaction that most recent moves have been in the direction of loosening and even rationalizing the regulations, and serious attention might well be given to accelerating this progress. The guiding principle should be to encourage rather than discourage the student from taking responsibility for his own academic courses.

So far we have discussed the regulations governing the choice and arrangement of existing courses. More serious problems are posed by the nature of the courses themselves. Here it is contended that the student has much less freedom of choice than appears at first glance, because many, if not indeed most, of the courses do not meet the needs of the student as he sees them, and therefore might as well not exist at all. On page 36 we have listed four major criticism of course offerings. Clearly, this is not the place for a thorough discussion of course content or the form in which it is presented. We shall merely try to mention certain points that are in some danger of being overlooked in the heat of debate and which may add some perspective to the rest of our report. In regard to points 1 and 2, for example, we will simply assert in passing that the tendency for some courses to deal with bits and pieces of knowledge is due only in part to a lack of vision on the part of the individual teacher and perhaps not at all to some malign conspiracy of the "system" to prevent the student from obtaining a view of life as a whole. Primarily, it is a result of the simple biological fact that the human mind is designed to think of only one thing at a time. Even the highly regarded "scientific method," though superbly efficient when dealing with one to a few variables, has proven almost absurdly incapable of giving us intelligible pictures of whole organisms or other complex systems, except as a laborious summation of parts. Possibly the computer and the presumably magical techniques of systems analysis will help us escape from our atomistic approach to knowledge, but they have not done so yet. The relating of bits and pieces of knowledge to one another, and the devising of ways and means for exploring subject areas between the established disciplines are indeed serious matters worth much continuing effort, but they are not likely to be easily and quickly accomplished.

In spite of all the inherent difficulties, scholars and teachers doubtless have more of responsibility than they willingly recognize to pull their specialized bits and pieces of knowledge together into some coherent conceptual framework. Indeed great scientists and scholars are great exactly because of their ability to bring a number of apparently unrelated facts together in one overwhelming generalization. One way of handling the teaching problem might be to go more explicitly into how generalizations and conceptual frameworks are made, when it is appropriate to go forward, and when it is wiser to hold back from premature generalization. Even if the teacher lacks the ability to impose order on some recently accumulated data, he should try to leave the student with the tools for fashioning an order of his own and a belief that order will ultimately be found.

In introducing our discussion of the third criticism (the lack of relevance of many existing courses to daily life) it may put things in perspective at least to mention the great expansion in the number of kinds of subjects offered by major universities during the last 100 years. Although universities had been gradually increasing the scope of their interests during the 18th and early 19th centuries, it was not until the American University system got under way in the 1860's that higher education became involved with subjects bearing on the productive activities and the quality of life of ordinary people. Progress since that time has been rapid. Indeed, many observers have been prompted to criticize the typical American college for being too preoccupied with the topical and vocational at the expense of more enduring general principles. At the moment, however, we are painfully aware of the failure to give proper attention to the history of the black people in our society and special social and economic problems which still face the majority of them. Furthermore, we are doubtless not concerned enough with the curious fact that Cornell has far more numerous offerings in rural sociology, rural education, and the special economic problems of farmers than it devotes to the special problems of the cities in which nearly 90% of the population attempts to find a satisfactory life. Nevertheless, with all its cultural lags, the modern American university must be recognized as more flexible in its outlook and more closely related to the everyday life of ordinary people than its counterparts in any other time or place.

The selection of what is and what is not "relevant" to present day problems is not so easy as is sometimes implied. Americans are particularly prone to the fallacy that the present can best be understood in terms of present happenings. Most of us, or at least most of our ancestors, came here to escape the past and we may have been all too successful, at least temporarily.

To some of us, however, it is beginning to seem highly probable that our policy towards China might have been very different (and considerably more enlightened) if any considerable number of our policy makers and the general public had taken the trouble to learn more about the history of the people that we happen to have come in contact with only in one of its periodic times of weakness. Certainly, our policy in Vietnam would have been different if we had thought more about the meaning of 19th century colonialism in South East Asia, and the vigor and determination of the Vietnamese in pushing the proud French Army out of their homeland.

Indeed, one might even hope that our whole handling of the power that descended on our shoulders in 1945 would have been wiser, more humane, and more successful if we had thought a little more about what happened to Athens when Pericles persuaded her that she was superior both in ideas and in military force, to anyone else.

The point is that it is harder than one thinks to tell in advance what bit of knowledge will be crucial to solving what problem. The natural sciences are full of examples of unexpected relevance. As a celebrated modern example, we may recall that knowledge of how electrons move through slightly impure crystals made the transistor possible; the transistor produced the modern computer within reasonable size and heat limitations, and the computer took three men around the moon.

All this adds up to saying that most of what goes on in a university of course, is "communication" between students and teachers. All too often teachers underplay or actually conceal the relevance of their knowledge out of a peculiar combination of false modesty and true intellectual snobbery. While modestly disclaiming usefulness as a virtue, they reach for a higher esteem in a lofty contempt for "mere utility." Some quite genuinely feel uncomfortable at being credited with a desire "to do good" when all they are doing is following their own curiousity. However convoluted their motives, teachers today must recognize and satisfy a need of students to relate themselves and their knowledge to significant social ends.

Finally, we come to the increasing demands that the University do something to give meaning and significance, or value to life. Much of the comment in this area is basically metaphysical, if not actually theological in tone. The argument takes many forms, and it appears to be too early to make any very useful and complete analysis. One way of stating the matter is to say that an increasing number of students come to the university in search of a sense of spiritual validity, if not indeed spiritual guidance, which they do not find. Among the things that puzzle some of the older generation of faculty brought up in a more austere tradition is the degree of hostility to the University engendered in some students by the discovery that the house of intellect has only a dusty answer to give to their apparently legitimate yearnings. A generation brough up on David Hume, C. S. Pierce, and Percy Bridgman has learned to recognize the power of scientific analysis to answer certain types of questions and its almost total incapacity to deal with others. The same generation is familiar with several revolutionary or at least rebellious reactions against the rule of reason--the romantic, the nihilist-anarchic, and the present day existentialist. Many remain unconvinced that any of these are certain guides to spiritual tranquility either.

Finally, most of the old men were in some measure prepared by the scientific work of Durkheim or the literary insight of Matthew Arnold and Henry Adams for the anomie, the moral dilemmas and the spiritual aridity of the 20th century. To a generation so trained, outcries against the university for not being able to answer questions of ultimate meaning seem at best misplaced. At worst, they are reminiscent of the immature hostility of the protagonist of Dostoievsky's "Notes from Underground" inveighing wildly against "the gentlemen" for insisting on the acceptance of a world in which two plus two make four.

Many of the current generation of students, on the other hand, regard the apparent acceptance of a world without meaning as at best a craven copping-out on man's most manifest responsibilities or at worst, a wicked conniving with the forces of evil. To agree, however reluctantly, that "we are here upon a darkling plain...where ignorant armies class by night" renders the older generation suspect of complicity with those who refuse to turn on the lights. Who knows, indeed, that they are not actually conspiring behind the scenes to draft the virtuous into the ignorant armies?

To renounce man's ability to make value judgments for the sake of a cooler, perhaps more accurate, analysis of things as they are is to sell one's birthright for a mess of pottage. Indeed, the prevailing preoccupation with natural science and other forms of objective scholarship has very probably left man worse off than he was before. What if our new knowledge has enabled the minority of the world's population to abolish hunger, control many of the sources of ill health and live out their lives in unprecedented comfort and luxury? The great majority are still about as badly off as ever and the absolute number of suffering humanity is probably the greatest on record. Worse than that, the affluence of the minority has been achieved at a frightening cost in unrenewable resources and the dangerous contamination of the natural environment. Furthermore, the progress of science has put into the hands of a tiny number of governors the power to regiment and control the lives of their subjects so that individual freedom has become well-nigh a meaningless phrase. Finally, over this dismal scene of materialism run wild--of selfishness, indifference and injustice--is spread the pervasive probability that a few wilful men will blow each other and most of the rest of the world completely to smithereens. And they will do this over matters of opinion which can scarcely be differentiated on politico-economic grounds and of no discernible moral content whatever.

c. The student, the university, and social reform

Many adult liberals will share with the young radicals a sense of dissatisfaction with the present state of the world. They differ in their interpretations of how it got that way and what should be done about it. More particularly, they tend to view the role of the university in quite opposite ways. If the older generation is prepared to admit that the world is frightening and all too frequently evil, it is still willing to accept the loneliness and evil as part of the nature of things. While its members may in large part have abandoned their grandfather's view of original sin, they have lived through enough pogroms, wars, and concentration camps to believe that most men are capable of more evil than they care to admit. Thus, they tend to perceive social and political systems and human institutions in general as means for curbing the evil propenstities and fostering the better, more social aspects of human life. Of course, such institutions are defective and in need of constant improvement. Nevertheless, the evidence seems convincing that most men behave better when constrained by custom, law, and good manners than when they act purely out of instinct. To most older people, the evils of the world are not reasons for abandoning science and scholarly analysis but rather a stimulus for developing them more intensively. Universitites, with all their defects, seem to men of this view among the best institutions ever devised for cultivating this approach to life and consequently for ameliorating the condition of man.

The radical reformers are more prone to accept a Romantic interpretation of man as basically or at least potentially good. It is the social systems he has devised that have corrupted him. Thus, they are prepared to agree that the University is the most significant of modern institutions, but they disagree about its generally benign effects. On the contrary, they argue, its net result is to dehumanize its students and to place increasing power in the hands of exploiters and war makers.

Furthermore, the unviersity is perceived as being so fully integrated into society, and especially with its most powerful and dangerous components, as to make it virtually beyond the reach of the influence of students and other virtuous influences. It is this perception which lies behind much of the clamor about student powerlessness and the demand to be allowed to make decisions affecting the student's own life.

To the observer who grew up in an earlier period when academic regulations and parietal rules were far more restrictive, today's students appear to have rather more control over their own day-to-day activities than students have ever had before or than almost any other element in society has today.

The case for student powerlessness rests much more substantially on the future students face outside the university than on their present condition within it. Most tangible and immediate of their problems, of course, is the draft law, and all the other dislocations involved in the prosecution of an unpopular war. If one escapes the draft, the situation seems only slightly improved. Although a variety of career choices seems to exist, this is largely an illusion. Most of them turn out to be 9-to-5 in an office coupled to an unimaginative, unexamined life in the suburbs.

To sensitive young men and women, it is simply intolerable that the university, of which they expected so much, has so little to say about these matters. It is seen as failing the student in at least two ways. By failing to provide adequate instruction in the philosophical and especially the moral aspects of modern life, it is not providing for the proper intellectual and emotional development of the individual students. By failing to exert its influence to change the course of political-social and economic events, it is at least passively conspiring with the rest of society to produce a world in which, to put it mildly, the student prefers not to participate.

In its external, most visible form, the students' cry for more power in the decisions which affect their own lives is a plea for more control of the kind of educational opportunity available in the university. Less immediately apparent but much more far-reaching in its potential effect is the desire to use the university as an active instrument for social reform.

Although this latter attitude strikes men of the older generation as unusual and very probably dangerous, the following points may at least be mentioned in support of the students' position.

1. At the very least, it reveals that students do indeed regard the university as important.

2. Students may well be right in feeling that the university is already more deeply involved than it recognizes in support of some of the bad features of the existing politico-social structure.

3. The university is obviously the institution with which the student is most familiar and it is natural that he should turn to it for help in facing an increasingly complex and apparently depersonalized world.

The issues involved in the demand for a meaningful and morally oriented teaching and for more use of the university as an active social force are too complex for full discussion in a report of this sort. We shall have a little more to say about each of them in other sections but we do not propose to attempt anything like a complete analysis. We feel, however, that any proposal for university reform which fails to take these questions into account will miss what is perhaps the most important aspect of the problem. Before we are through, therefore, we shall try to suggest mechanisms through which all the constituencies of the university can give these matters the extended consideration they require.

PART II SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE

Introduction

As we have seen, some of the deepest sources of dissatisfaction with the university may be traced to dissatisfaction with the nature of modern industrial society, and even perhaps with the nature of the human condition itself. Certainly student dissatisfaction and unrest is not confined to Cornell, to the United States, or even to Western industrial society. When one observes that roughly the same complaints are heard at "permissive" Antioch and Bennington as at authoritarian Madrid, Moscow, and Tokyo, at student-centered liberal arts colleges as at research-oriented universities, at residential colleges as at large, municipal institutions catering only to commuters, one wonders how much can be accomplished by changes in administrative structure, however drastic. Two sorts of questions arise.

1. Is it worthwhile to examine the complaints as they apply directly to the university and to try to alter the existing machinery to meet these complaints, even though one knows in advance that such a limited approach will leave the fundamental causes outside the university relatively untouched?
2. How far is it wise to go in altering the structure of the university so as to make it into a more effective weapon for a direct, essentially political attack on the evils of society?

The remainder of this report will proceed on the assumption that the answer to the first question is yes. The purpose of its recommendations is to improve the capacity of the university to fulfill its three stated functions. The mere fact that those who most vigorously call attention to existing evils within the university will probably not be content with their elimination, does not make their elimination any the less desirable. Many of us would disagree with those members of the new left who regard the university as so bad that it should be eliminated so that some lovely new but still undescribed entity can well up from below to take its place. Our disagreement with them should not keep us either from recognizing what is bad or from trying to correct it.

Discussion of the second question may be posponed to the end of this report. Suffice it to say here that the administrative changes to be suggested were designed with the internal needs of the university primarily in mind. For example, the University Council to be outlined as one way of dealing with general policy questions facing the university might wish in the future to consider putting the university into a more politically active position. The fact that it might have such a capacity does not imply that the Commission designed it for this purpose.

It will also be obvious that the report emphasizes changes which can be undertaken within the existing framework for the distribution of formal power within the university. Rather than proposing far-reaching constitutional changes, this paper concentrates on measures which can be taken within the existing framework for the following reasons:

1. It appears that a great deal can be done quickly and easily within existing legislative authority. For example, the faculty has all the power it needs (within existing financial constraints) to deal with the questions currently raised about curriculum, the grading system and so forth. It also has the power to share decisions in these matters with students and has recently demonstrated a commendable tendency to do so.

2. Constitutional changes of any consequence such as the elimination of the sovereignty of the Trustees or some procedure for sharing it with faculty and students would be likely to take a long time and might easily divert attention away from much needed changes which can be effected much more simply.

3. The present procedure whereby the Board of Trustees delegates much of its power to the President and faculty has evolved over a long period of time, and involves many tacit understandings and mutual trusts which might well be jeopardized by a frontal attack on its sovereign position. Although the present structure may seem relatively unresponsive to certain current issues on the campus, it has worked in general to protect the university from political changes in the outside world, as well as from pressures from special interest groups. In this respect, the American University is far better off than those that report directly to ministers of education, to legislative bodies or to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as is the case in most other countries.

4. In the present climate of public opinion, it seems unlikely that the New York legislature, the federal government or individual private donors would feel entirely comfortable about entrusting large sums of money to a board in which preponderant power was held by students and faculty.

Perhaps a greater danger would be that faculty members in a position of ultimate sovereignty would feel under pressure to modify opinions on controversial questions in order to convey the impression of "soundness" usually required by university trustees.

5. Finally, the Commission feels that if a major redistribution of power and authority is to be undertaken, recommendations for such changes should be made by a body far more representative of all the parties at interest. As we prepare this final draft of the report, we are aware that plans for such a representative assembly are already underway.

Specific Proposals

II A Academic Matters

1. Strengthening the Student as Individual Decision Maker

Everything possible should be done to impress the student with his own responsibility for his own education. In order to exercise this responsibility he should not only be freed from unnecessary restraints, but be given all possible aid and assistance.

a. In an earlier section attention was called to certain rigidities in the requirements of some of our constituent colleges. These should be relaxed in so far as relaxation is consistent with the need to certify students as qualified in certain professional areas; and with a desire to ensure that all students become familiar with the possibilities inherent in three major areas of scholarship. Experiments such as the College Scholar Program in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College Program in the Engineering School are steps in the right direction and should be vigorously pursued.

Recommendation: All colleges and departments should continue to examine both major and distribution requirements with a view to modifying them so as to encourage the student to take increasing responsibility for fashioning his own educational experience, with due regard for protecting the still immature student from taking refuge in superficiality on the one hand or prematurely foreclosing his options on the other.

b. If the student is to make wise choices, he must have at hand as much information as possible about the nature of the options open to him. This implies substantial improvement in the nature of the documents available to him, and in the operation of the advisory system. Course descriptions in the existing official announcements of the various colleges do not convey adequate information about course content and virtually nothing about method of presentation. In theory, an unofficial publication like INDEX is in a better position to give frank appraisals of those features likely to be of the greatest interest to the student. In practice, INDEX ha not yet proven to be as successful as might be hoped, although it has improved steadily. It still covers too small a proportion of the significant courses and relies too heavily on statements of intent by the teacher, rather than on appraisals of actual results as judged by an adequate sample of students. It is our understanding that lack of adequate funding and lack of student interest in doing the necessary course reviews have hampered development so far. The importance of providing suitable advice about courses to students is such as to fully justify subsidizing INDEX from general university funds. If the spirit behind the numerous academic reform movements now so prominent on the campus is at all genuine, it should provide the energy necessary for greater students participation in INDEX. Perhaps the Cornell Sun could lend its publishing expertise and organizational backing to the enterprise. The local student newspaper has taken the initiative in starting similar enterprises on other campuses.

c. If, as seems likely, the present structure of requirements -- language, distribution, and major -- is to be considerably relaxed, it is important that the student be provided with an adequate summary of the reason for believing that a knowledge of one or more foreign languages and a familiarity with fields of learning other than one's own should form a normal part of a general or liberal arts education. Similarly, each department should provide an explanation of what it thinks a student wishing expert knowledge in a given area should do as an undergraduate, and why. In this conncection it is perhaps useful to emphasize again that the object of these exercises is to develop in the student a sense of responsibility for himself and his own future. We feel that there is a crucial educational difference between taking physical chemistry, for example, simply because it is an arbitrary departmental requirement, and electing to do so because of a clear understanding that much of modern biology can be understood in physical chemical terms.

d. No system which relies entirely on printed materials, however well prepared, can provide adequate help to the student who wishes to design his own educational career. Most students feel the need of discussing their future with an older, more experienced person. Almost all universities, therefore, maintain some arrangements for undergraduate advising by members of the faculty. At Cornell, the arrangements very widely from College to College. There is room for improvement in all, but the situation in the Arts College appears to fall especially far below the ideal. The change two years ago which had the effect of transferring much of the burden of guiding students through the important first years from faculty to the overworked counsellors in the Deans' office seems particularly unfortunate. Inevitably, the result has been to emphasize the bureaucratic aspects of fulfilling stated requirements.

This is not the place for a full discussion of student advising; we merely wish to call attention to the necessity of substantial improvement if the student is to realize the full advantages of the increasing opportunity to make decisons about his own educational experience.

Recommendation: The faculties of the individual colleges should examine their advisory systems and where necessary take steps to ensure that every student has the opportunity to develop a continuing relationship with a wise and concerned member of the faculty who can help him design an educational experience suitable to his present capacities and future needs.

e. One of the best ways for a student to decide whether or not a given course is "for him" is actually to try it out. With some exercise of foresight a student could easily audit three or four lectures of a course he could plan to take in the following year. Perhaps, more realistic is the suggestion that the students be encouraged to "shop around" and attend exercises in several different courses during the first two work weeks of the term before deciding on final registration. This suggestion has in fact already been made by the Dean of the Arts College but has not been received with much enthusiasm by those responsible for the mechanics of registration or by teachers in charge of scheduling large laboratory courses.

Recommendations: It is recommended that the possibility of postponing final registration and encouraging students to "shop around" at the beginning of term be further explored.

f. To anyone familiar with other colleges in its class, Cornell seems particularly deficient in opportunities for independent studies and research. Correlated with this is the relatively small number of students in honors programs. Properly conducted honors and independent study programs are perhaps the best way yet discovered for emphasizing the responsibility of a student for his own development and giving him a much desired sense of freedom from arbitrary constraints. They also tend to personalize the educational process and to provide opportunities for getting to know at least one member of the faculty reasonably well. In the laboratory sciences, a student may actually begin to feel himself part of a group of investigators and scholars, and a welcome member of the informal laboratory lunches and coffee breaks as well as more formal departmental seminars.

It is true that the highly motivated student at Cornell can utilize the machinery provided by research and special topics courses to achieve some semblance of the freedom allowed junior and senior honors students working with a tutor at Harvard or Reed, but the process is cumbersome and still too much involved with a juvenile concern for course credits.

Recommendation: Every effort should be made by departments, educational policy committees, and the faculties of various colleges to provide opportunities for qualified students to reduce course credit requirements and pursue independent study and research. It should be left to the individual colleges to decide whether the effectiveness of such individual work should be evaluated on the basis of a general examination, a thesis, or both.

2. Student participation in formal decision making.

The preceding section was devoted to ways and means of exploiting the normal decentralization of decision making in the university so as to develop the ability of the individual student to make the most important decisions affecting his own academic career. The emphasis has been primarily on the making of choices among existing options. We turn now to the place of the student as part of the decision making process which results in broadening the number of improving the quality of the options available.

a. General considerations

As pointed out in earlier parts of this report, most of the decisions regarding course content and method of presentation are made by the individual professors giving the course. Decisions regarding the number of courses in different areas, the sequence in which they should be taken, and the grouping of courses into a satisfactory "major," are usually initiated by departments and decided by them with the advice and consent of the faculty committee on educational policy. Long term decisions about the size of departments, and areas to be covered within a given discipline, and so on are worked out through a complicated interplay between administration and faculty.

In this section we consider the ways in which students might appropriately participate in decisions at the level of the individual faculty member, the department, and the faculty committee on educational policy. There is no doubt that if students are to have an influence in academic matters, this influence must primarily be exerted at these levels. There is also little or no doubt that inclusion of students in decision making at these levels will have good effects both on the decisions and on the students. Though one may be legitimately concerned about the amount of time teachers and students must spend to effect *any* change in traditional offerings, the very process of discussion and evaluations of the existing situation and of proposed alternatives is educational and should more than compensate for the time lost from conventional pursuits.

It is far more difficult to suggest the exact form student participation should take. In the first place, there is the large variety of courses offered and the organizational framework in which they occur. The question of relevance of content is quite different, for example, in a course on economic entomology than in one on Icelandic literature. Questions of teaching method -- the use of laboratory work, visual aids, discussion sections, and so on, vary not only with course content but with the numbers and kinds of students wishing to take the course and above all, with the number of characteristics of the teaching personnel available. The variety in existing organizational arrangements can be illustrated by citing the fact that one of the schools on this campus has no departments at all. Departments vary in mission from the purest abstract scholarship to the most obvious practical applications of knowledge. The number of majors in a department may vary from a mere handful to the several hundred enrolled in English or in the biological sciences.

Aside from the foregoing practical difficulties, there are theoretical reasons for a Commission like this one to refrain from making single specific recommendations for organizational rearrangements at this level. Interestingly enough, both the traditional academician and the theoreticians of the new left unite in asking third parties to keep their hands off individual faculty members and departments. The traditional academic emphasizes the importance of maintaining the autonomy of the individual teacher and his discipline. The new left argues that it is both arrogant and useless to present the student with contrived opportunities for representation in decision making. In order to be effective, students must first become conscious of their plight, consolidate their power and then demand participation. These stipulations are likely to be coupled with grave reservations about representative government; and it is perfectly obvious that college communities are encountering great difficulty in arranging for governing procedures which adequately reflect student opinion.

Indeed, one of the things that made the deliberations of this Commission so difficult, and so time consuming, was the repeated assertion of many of the student members that they were speaking only for themselves. At its purest and most profound, this view appears to stem from 19th century theorists such as Bakunin and Proudhon who considered all social or political organizations as bad unless they simply "well up from below."

Somewhat curiously, the pragmatic liberal has little difficulty in agreeing that in order to be effective, student involvement must to a large degree be spontaneous. Invited student representatives on boards and committees, especially if elected on criteria that ordinarily command the attention of the majority of students, are not likely to be terribly interested in academic matters, nor well informed about them.

In view of the need to meet a variety of situations and to adjust to the theoretical and practical considerations outlined above, it seems inevitable that the final form of student interaction with faculty and departments must be left to the participants themselves. The following suggestions may be helpful.

b. Course committees and workshops

The Commission spent a good deal of time discussing the possibility that some students taking an individual course might get together by themselves, perhaps, and later with teaching assistants and professors, to discuss the content of the course, its meaning to the student and its relationship to other types of knowledge or to activities outside the academy. How such a scheme might operate may best be conveyed by quoting from a paper prepared by one member of the Commission who has given a good deal of thought to the problem and has in fact experimented with a model similar to the one proposed.

> "When we speak of decision making at Cornell let us settle at once the nonsensical idea that there is anything which _must_ be taught a priori. What _must_ be taught is what students and faculty in a centuries old dialogue come together and find exciting and relevant to explore. When students assert the truth of this and fight for it, then we can discuss what kind of a structure will best facilitate that goal. For a start, I would urge students to organize in the classroom to consider the relevance and value of the particular course they are attending. I would urge them to speak with their teachers about books the students

> consider relevant and about setting aside time to discuss that reading and any other questions about the worth of that course and the way in which it is being taught. I would urge some representatives of the class to devote time and care to the writing of lengthy position papers evaluating the course, teacher and methodology and to submit those papers to their teacher, other members of the class and the Department Chairman."

An obvious drawback to concentrating attention on the individual course is the transitory and episodic nature of the situation. Student participants scarcely become familiar with content and mode of presentation when the course is over and their attention moves on to other matters. Suggestions for modification of content are difficult to implement in mid-career. It may well require most of the term to receive an adequate supply of a new book for example. Nevertheless, the idea seems worth trying and we hope it will be, even though its major benefits will be enjoyed by succeeding generations of students rather than the ones directly involved.

c. Departmental committees

It appears that somewhat more stable and continuing arrangements could be arranged at the departmental level. In addition to the emphasis on individual course offerings discussed above, decision making at the departmental level provides an opportunity to view individual courses in a larger context. There appears to be no particular difficulty in visualizing the functions of a student committee attached to a given department, and meeting periodically sometimes by itself and at others in concert either with the department as a whole or in large departments. with an executive committee or a special purpose group like a departmental curriculum committee.

Some observers feel that a separate student committee meeting by itself is likely to be an ineffective formality. At least two points may be mentioned in favor of some separation between students and faculty at the departmental level. One is purely mechanical: students may need to familiarize themselves with a cerain amount of background detail already well known to the faculty and which they would find it exceedingly boring to rehearse. Secondly, the student group may wish to review among themselves the performance of individual teachers in a way which it would be embarrassing or unnecessarily painful to do with the faculty present.

Nevertheless, the student committee must have opportunities to engage itself in a real way with departmental deliberations on matters which affect students, and almost everything does. A good deal of the discussion of how to make students more effective, centers on whether student members hould vote on departmental decisons and if so, what should be their role in voting strength. It is very likely that the matter of voting is overemphasized. Certainly, most academic administrators try to avoid actions which depend on close votes. It would be very unlikely for example, that a given professor would be relieved of responsibility for a particular course on the basis of a close departmental vote.

In the more difficult and important matter of introducing a new course, voting would appear to be irrelevant. Only at the elementary and low intermediate level does it seem at all wise to make the existence or non-existence of a course dependent on a majority vote. Even here, the need for given types of courses, is more or less evident to all. The more familiar problem is to find the person with the right qualifications who is also willing to give the time to developing a satisfactorily exciting new approach to an old subject.

Here, properly organized and cogently expressed student opinion may actually be more effective than any formal machinery in persuading reluctant faculty dragons to take on new assignments. Note that the operational word is "persuade." Faculty members are notably recalcitrant to being ordered or compelled by individual administrators, be they provosts, deans or chairmen, and they are scarcely more amenable to the votes of their colleagues.

What must be sought is an arrangement or perhaps simply an atmosphere in which students can be heard as equals in discussion of courses and other curriculum matters, with their ultimate influence resting principally on the persuasiveness of their arguments. Actually of course even though the faculty in all its deliberations operates normally on a one man, one vote basis, the weight given to the opinions of given individuals differs markedly. Such factors as the individual's reputation for wisdom (usually built up over years), his standing in his field, the degree of loss to be felt by his colleagues and the university as a whole were he to resign -- all play a role. Individual students will have more difficulty developing this kind of weight in council, but their situation is far from hopeless. Every year several students become identified for their intelligence, energy, and wisdom and are in fact paid more attention then many of their elders.

There is one area in which departmental votes are regularly taken which carry with them very important long range implications.

This is the matter of new appointments to staff. Nothing determines more certainly the quality and direction of a department than the quality and field of interest of its appointments. Ordinarily the intiative is largely in the hands of the department itself, although, as we have seen, the ad hoc committees represent the interest of the faculty as a whole in maintaining quality and the administration retains the right of review and veto.

Since appointments are likely to have their effect over a long period of time, and the members of the department will have to "live with," and be responsible for, the result long after the students have moved elsewhere, it seems at least doubtful that student opinion should be given a weight equal to that of the faculty in this important matter. Nevertheless, student opinion is important in at least two respects: the appraisal of the teaching ability of the candidate, and whether or not his field of interest covers the felt needs of the student body. As Jencks and Riesman and many others point out, academic disciplines tend to develop internal criteria of what is important (and fashionable) and sometimes this may lead them in directions farther and farther from the felt needs of students. To cite a familiar example, it appears that much of the intellectual progress in the field of academic philosophy during the 20th century has been in the analysis of symbols and syntax. Elegant though this discipline is, it does not appear to the student to bear on his search for value and meaning in a rapidly changing world. Students have an obvious right as well as a need to be heard on such matters. Student representatives should therefore be included in the early stages of discussions leading to new appointments. Since for various reasons their opinions may not always be fully effective at the level of departmental discussion, it seems reasonable to suggest that they should also have the right to send independent written opinions of teaching ability and the relevance of a candidate's field of interest through the department head to the ad hoc committee considering the appointment, or to the dean.

d. The question of selection and representation

Although we earlier discussed in a general way some of the problems involved in obtaining adequate student representation for departmental committees, we have left the discussion of specific methods until the end. The problem is a difficult one and merits a good deal of experimentation with various patterns before coming to a definite conclusion in regard to what is best for a particular college or department.

The following propositions seem relevant:

Service of the kind described requires considerable time and energy as well as knowledge of the subject and of educational principles in general. Only highly motivated individuals with the qualifications mentioned should be selected.

Effectiveness depends in large part on accumulated experience so that a considerable proportion of the members of a departmental committee should serve for periods of at least two and preferably three years. On the other hand, such a policy might unduly restrict the number of points of view to be represented. Some experimentation is clearly needed in this area.

Students majoring in the field in question have the greatest stake in the results and the greatest familiarity with the subject and with the faculty personnel. The majority of the committee should thus be drawn from undergraduate and graduate majors.

Most departments also provide important services to non-majors by providing instruction in courses essential for understanding the student major field, as physics and chemistry are for biology. Equally important are courses unrelated to the major field which are intended to broaden and deepen the student's experience with life in general. If anything, the presentation of satisfactory courses to fulfill these two purposes is more difficult than providing satisfactory instruction in a major field. Some way must be found for enlisting the help of thoughtful students outside the major department.

In relatively small departments, where most of the students taking a major are likely to know each other rather well, it seems probable that the entire group could get together to elect the membership of the departmental committee to be drawn both from students majoring in the field and from those outside. In larger departments a somewhat different procedure may be suggested. Students might be grouped on the basis of the faculty adviser with whom they are associated. Each group could then be asked to nominate a representative for the departmental committee, the final choice to be made from elections by the department as a whole. The committee thus chosen could then select a certain number of representatives from non-majors.

II B QUALITY OF COMMUNITY

1. General Considerations

It is of course, obvious that there are many things that go on in universities and colleges outside the class room which have an important bearing on the intellectual, emotional, and moral development of young men and women. Especially in England and the United States, the university has recognized an explicit responsibility for organizing living arrangements and a wide variety of community activities in such a way as to contribute substantially to the educational purposes of the institution.

In an earlier section of this report, we have discussed in some detail certain impediments to the development of a sense of community at Cornell. The problem is a complicated one, full of paradox and contradictions. For on the one hand, the university regards itself as a single community with a unified set of purposes. On the other hand, in the pursuit of the same unified set of purposes, it encourages diversity of opinion and the intensive cultivation of individual personality. At its most fundamental level, the university community can only be held together by the trust of its members in each others motives, and a common belief not only in the right to disagree but in the obligation to do so. For a university is dedicated to the propositon that creation of new knowledge and of new institutions is essentially a process of selecting the most suitable from a wide variety of possible alternatives.

The concern felt by many older faculty and by the more sober members of society at large over campus violence is, at base, a concern for the continuing health of the creative process for which the university exists. The attempts of some student activists to reduce the number of ideas and activities on the campus by whatever method, attacks the creative process at its source.

The more sincere activists on the other hand, see the encouragement of diversity with its necessary suspension of committment to particular ends, as essentially immoral. They prefer, as many others before them have preferred, what appears to be more direct processes for determining truth and righteousness. There appears to be no easy way of restoring a sense of community among those who seek truth through a laborious process of intellectual analysis, checked by empirical proof, and those who would rush toward it on a wave of vision and revelation.

There is no doubt that the events of the past year have revealed a profound lack of communication between various groups within the university on such basic philosophical matters as those just outlined. The older generation of faculty have proceeded for so long on their agreed upon assumptions that many have come to regard them as an inevitable part of "the way the world is made." It seems scarcely worth while to pull them out for reexamination or for explicit presentation and discussion with the oncoming generation. To many of their more thoughtful students, such faculty have appeared to be preoccupied with the technical details of knowledge at the expense of its fundamental structure and purpose. To students this preoccupation results in mechanical training to fit existing slots in industry, government and business.

The crisis atmosphere of the last two weeks of April have shown us all how great the gap was, and has suggested some machinery for closing it. It will of course take a very long time to analyse all the sources and effects of the Barton Hall experience, but perhaps the most important result will be found in the realm of mood and emotion. In spite of the painful realization of how far apart we were on some fundamental matters, most faculty and students seem to have emerged with a stronger feeling than they had before of belonging to the same community. There is also a greater sense of urgency about communicating with each other on matters of basic philosophy. At this level, events clearly have superseded anything the Commission might have suggested. Nevertheless, it may be worth recording our feeling that a good deal remains to be done in improving what might be called the technology of communication within the community. Among other things this includes the rearrangement and improvement of facilities for housing and dining, the regulations and procedures governing student conduct, and the modes of participation of students in the non-curricular aspects of campus life.

2 Management of the University Community

a. Housing and Dining

The Commission spent a good deal of time looking into the management of certain practical affairs which affect the community in various ways. Thus we reviewed in some detail the long series of decisions which resulted in the plan for the new dormitories now under consideration. We also tried to grasp the way in which the existing arrangements for housing and dining are managed. During the course of these investigations, two other Commissions were appointed, one chairedby Professor Alain Seznec to look specifically into the ways of improving the overall plan to student living arrangements and the other chaired by Professor David Allee to study the management of existing facilities. These groups went about their specific tasks with great diligence. The first has already reported and it is our understanding that the Allee Committee will do so in the near future. This Commission has therefore felt it unnecessary to pursue its studies in this area to a conclusion.

It may be worthwhile to record our impression that the major difficulty in matters of housing and dining and related areas is how to reconcile the need for efficient and financially sound management with the need of students to feel that the conditions surrounding their day to day lives is substantially under their control. Few if any students will wish to participate in the detailed day-to-day management of housing and dining facilities; and it is unlikely in any case that they would be parpared to act effectively in such a role. On the other hand, they do have a right to make sure that these facilities are managed in the best interest of themselves as the primary consumers.

b. Other Management Problems

Much of the frustration felt by both students and faculty in dealing with the administration apparatus is simply the result of what in industry would be regarded as poor management. Students have difficulty getting information about the simplest matters, waste hours straightening out misunderstandings about term bills and grade reports, and frequently have trouble arranging for advice in working out a suitable educational program. Faculty complain about delays in purchasing supplies and equipment, or making simple alterations in their offices and laboratories. More significant are the disturbances which occur when a minor official writes a draft board a letter in clear violation of university policy or another attempts to suppress a student publication. Such incidents are often interpreted as assaults on students rights when in reality they are simply failures in communication within an all too rickety management apparatus.

Far more important is the difficulty the modern university has in bringing its various constituencies together to agree upon priorities and to deploy its resources in satisfactory balance. It is only slowly becoming recognized that an appropriate balance between the three conventional objectives of the university - education, research, and public service-are not achieved automatically. Too often in the past the amount and kind of each of these activities has been determined by the availability of funds from outside sources, rather than a conscious balancing of needs within the university. Indeed the very existence of the certain needs, especially of students, has been largely overlooked until very recently.

Though aware in various degrees of the defects of the existing management apparatus in dealing with the presumably simple "business" problems mentioned earlier, the Commission concentrated most of its attention on educational matters and the making of overall policy. These appeared to be of the greater urgency and in any case the Commission was far from appropriately constituted to act as Management Consultants. Nevertheless, the Chairman cannot resist this opportunity to say publicly what he has long maintained privately: Cornell along with most other universities should drastically overhaul and modernize the strictly business aspects of its operations.

c. STUDENT CONDUCT

We gave relatively scant attention to matters of student conduct, since it originally appeared to us that the set of procedures growing out of the Sindler report were proceeding in a satisfactory direction. It now appears that further restructuring is necessary in this area. The Commission has no specific suggestion and would feel that in any case, recommendations should come from a body with a far wider political base than we have.

3. Various Student Activities

Students already play a major role in many extracurricular activities which determine the intellectual and esthetic atmosphere of the campus. The excellent record of the Cornell Sun during the past year demonstrates how important an organization run entirely by students can be. Other student organizations provide us with a considerable portion of the serious cinema, live theatre, and radio programming available to us. Although participating less in the management of the chorus, orchestra and band, students are the essential performers in all three.

Students also participate in committees such as those which bring lecturers and performing arts to the campus and we applaud the general principle of student participation at this level. However, we made no specific investigation of the degree of participation in each case and have no recommendations to make, other than to suggest that each one of these enterprises examine its own precedures to determine whether or not student participation is at an optimal level.

In view of the success of student run daily newspapers on this and other campuses, the relative weakness of other forms of student journalism is certainly puzzling and probably deplorable. Student humor magazines enjoyed a flourishing if not very sophisticated existence in an earlier period, and there is a long but on the whole, discouraging history of "literary" journals. Journals of opinion have been curiously lacking. In these days when all of us are reexamining basic assumptions, and taking positions on such policy issues as the support of research by the Department of Defense, there is an obvious place for a campus journal which would publish articles and essays by students, faculty and other interested parties. The events of the last few months have made it clear how ignorant most of us are about the history and meaning of such phrases as "academic freedom", "institutionalized racism", Community consciousness", "legitimacy" and the like. Each one is full of complexities and subtleties which cannot be properly explored or conveyed in a dialogue for two bullhorns. Even the facts involved in various lively issues remain unpresented in intelligible form. How many of us know the relative size of the budgets of the humanities and science departments and their rates of expansion during the last five controversial years? Is it really true that funds are being diverted from teaching to research, or does teaching actually benefit by the presence on the campus of facilities and personnel paid for from research funds? How much time and effort do our professors spend away from the campus consulting with industry and various government agencies? How much of the experience so gained helps to make their teaching more "relevant" to problems in the outside world? Questions of this kind are continuously bandied about the campus, and often are provided with summary answers which fit the purposes of the speaker far more accurately than they fit the facts.

It may therefore be recommended that serious consideration should be given to the establishment of a journal for the publication of essays and articles on educational matters, including interaction between the university and society at large. In view of the precarious nature of periodical publishing, some subsidy would probably be necessary, at least initially. This should be provided if a suitable group of interested students or students and faculty present themselves.

II C THE MAKING OF OVERALL POLICY

1. General Considerations

As pointed out above, the university has been deliberately designed to decentralize decision making, especially on matters of research and teaching. The Commission appreciated the reasons for this decentralization and previous sections of this report show that the Commission concentrated on ways of improving the quality of decentralized decision-making particularly by faculty and students. However, many of the issues that have plagued this and other campusus in recent years involve the university as a whole, and demand some mechanism for centralized consideration and decision. Indeed, it might save a good deal of unseemly recrimination if all the constituencies of the university would stand back for a moment and reflect that neither the faculty nor administration have been selected for skill in centralized decision making, or the manipulation of political power, much less for their ability as police officers. Why should we be so surprised and angry with so many of them and so many different institutions for failing to meet entirely new threats to the functioning of our traditionally decentralized structure? Rather, we should have been worried if any substantial numbers had proven themselves as unusually skilled in the handling of centralized power, with a precise sense of timing in calling the police.

Nevertheless, it is now clear that universities must develop new and more centralized ways of dealing with policy questions involving the whole university. Some of these are largely internal, others involve the interaction of the university with society at large. In earlier sections of this report, reasons have been given for believing that it is concerned about certain national issues, especially those involving the Vietnam War and the military industrial complex, which underlies much student dissatisfaction with the university.

The Commission gave a good deal of thought to the foregoing problems and some consideration to new administrative structures which might contribute to their solutions. A possible model was found at least by some of us in a council, senate, board or committee, representative of the entire University community. Probably such a council would be needed in the best of times but it is clearly indispensable in a time of rapid change like the present. During the past few years, a number of incidents have occurred, for the settlement of which no clear policy line seems to have been available. Most of these were dealt with by central administration on an ad hoc temporary basis and then referred to some special committee or commission for more detailed study. Ultimately the deliberations of such a commission may emerge in the form of a report which may then be referred to by various relevant constituencies on the campus for further study and dicussion. The final synthesis, if any, may take the form of a faculty resolution, an executive action on the part of the administration, or a formal decision by the Board of Trustees. At no stage in these proceedings is there opportunity for direct exchange of views among all the interested parties, much less for the determination of some group decison or consensus.

2. A University Senate or Council?

It would seem far better if major policy issues could be dealt with, in the first instance, by a boradly representative group already in being and with experience in the consideration of similar matters. Examples of the kind of problem which might be dealt with by such a body are the handling of student records, the use of human beings in experiments, the restrictions and regulations under which university property may be used for non-university purposes, the status of ROTC and so on. Such a body might also concern itself with matters involving the quality of the physical, intellectual and esthetic aspects of the Cornell environment, and other matters of common concern.

The argument of such a body is based only in part on the need of a better and more rapid way of making policy decisons affecting the whole university. There is also an obvious need for improving the level of public discussion of these matters. All of us who have served on the Commission feel that we have learned a great deal which we did not know before about how the University functions and what might be done to improve it. We have also been forced to examine various assumptions about the educational process which some of us had accepted more or less uncritically from previous generations. Because of the press of meeting our more immediate responsibilities, we frequently had to turn aside with regret from a lively discussion of institutional policy. This experience has convinced us of the purely educational potential of a high level group, representative of all constituencies for a continuing discussion of university policies. In order to be maximumly effective, such discussion should ordinarily take place in public, with an opportunity for participation either orally or by written questions on the part of a larger audience. Carefully conducted public discussion of the basic philosophy underlying such phrases as academic freedom, freedom to learn or freedom of expression could be an important educational experience for the entire community, as well as helping to direct the institution to the best decison in a specific instance.

The exact composition of such a council may remain a matter for further discussion. As a starter, the administration, the faculty and the student body should all be substantially represented as they have been, at least in principle, on this Commission. Serious thought should also be given to including representation from the Board of Trustees.

Although any increase in size of such a body tends to decrease the sense of participation, the council should be as broadly representative of the various elements which go to make up Cornell as possible, probably 40-50. The Provost should be a regular member ex-officio, preside over its meetings and set the agenda with the help of a committee composed of the Dean of the Faculty and a representative of the student membership.

Although one of its important functions would be to advise and consult with the President at his request, the primary function of the proposed body would be to foresee policy issues and devise courses of action before the situation reached emergency proportions. It would also have overall responsibility for other joint committees set up to consider special policy or operating problems.

A question immediately arises as to the relationship between the proposed body and the sphere of influence of the faculty. In the first place it should be said that the University Council is not thought of as superseding the faculty in matters regarded as normally within the latter's primary sphere of interest. The reason for its existence is to be found instead in the broad range of issues for which conventional faculty machinery has proved inadequate. As pointed out above, the increasing number of issues that involve the whole community and often bear particularly heavily on students have recently led to the appointment of numerous presidential commissions. Characteristically these commissions have been more broadly representative of the community and especially of the student body than is customary on the usual faculty committee. We take these facts as indicative of the need for something new and different in the structure of University government.

Questions will also be asked about the power of the proposed body to implement its decisions. It is certainly not easy to define the distribution of power in the University structure. In a formal sense all power resides in the Board of Trustees. In practice, power is diffused throughout the entire structure, sometimes by formal delegation, more often perhaps by custom. Much depends on the confidence the Board develops in the ability of administration and of faculty and student groups to make decisions on their own and carry them out effectively. One way of stating one's hopes for the effectiveness of the proposed council is to say that the Board of Trustees might be expected to begin by paying careful attention to its recommendations in matters of overall policy. As the council gains experience and proves its capacity, it can be further expected that the Board would come to follow its guidance in overall policy making in much the same way as it now follows the recommendations of the faculty in such strictly academic matters as the appointment of professors and the awarding of degrees.

As we prepare this version of our report, it is clear that a large proportion of the Cornell community is prepared to accept the need for some new administrative advice, which brings together representatives of all the major constituencies of the university.

Indeed, a larger constituent assembly to develop such new machinery is in the process of being rapidly forged in the flames of necessity as these words are written.

We therefore include at this point in this report, a lengthy and thoughtful essay on the parameters which must be taken into account in designing new machinery for student participation in major policy decisions affecting the whole university. It was written some months ago by a student member with extensive experience in the operation (and non-operation) of previous experiments in student government.

3. Representation and Other Problems Involved in Student Participation

by Stephen Hadley

(I) Any decision making process must be tailored to the particular needs and characteristics of the environment at Cornell. The difficulty in talking of a "student community" must be recognized as one of these characteristics of the Cornell environment and as posing a problem with respect to student role in decision making. There is a great mass, predominantly of male undergraduates, who feel little identification with "Cornell University" or their fellow students. For many of these students this lack of identification is a result of a living situation that places them in off-campus apartments for three years after the freshman dorm experience. The central activities of these students are off-campus and their only tie to the "University Community" is through classes. Combine this with a passive attitude toward classroom education, and the result is a group of students unexcited by campus-oriented issues. Another major group of uninvolved students can be found in the fraternity system. For many of these students, activities of any relevance are centered in an off-campus living unit -- the fraternity house. Campus concerns seem rather distant and of little effect upon their lives. These examples are merely to suggest a possible explanation for what is a fundamental characteristic of a great portion of the undergraduate student body -- a total lack of feeling of common identity with other members of the student body resulting in an absence of any sense of community within this segment of the student body. This manifests itself in indifference to campus-oriented issues and a failure to exhibit a concern for education policy.

In contrast to this uninvolved constituency is an as yet minority group of students actively concerned with issues of university policy and academic reform. Though not an identifiable group by any means, students of this persuasion appear to have a much more developed sense of a "university community," of an identification with other students as fellow participants in a university living and educational experience.

There is a general ideological split between these two groups. The uninvolved student is usually more "conservative" on matters of educational reform and the university's role in society -- when he expresses himself on these matters. The active and concerned student is more "liberal" in these areas.

In this general characterization of the student body can be seen the roots of the problems Cornell faces in defining the role of students in decision making. On one hand is a large mass of students who care little about participation in the decision process, On the other are students who care very much about this role. Separating these two groups is an ideological gap. The problem is to include these active students interested in taking a role in university decision-making in the policy forming process while still permitting the majority of the student body to exert a check upon these students on specific issues when its interest is aroused.

(2) There is a second characteristic of the Cornell environment that is important with regard to decision making process. This is that Cornell, like most universities, is a product of participation of many different constituencies. It cannot be said to be the possession by right of either the students or faculty, or both. The decision making process must reflect those groups that have a real stake in the university and its operation. A list of these groups could stretch to alumni, campus employees, parents, and the like. But it seems that those who should participate in the university decision making process can be narrowed to four groups who are most intimately involved in the university as an institution.

(a) The students, for whom the university is a place of learning and personal growth during many critical years of their lives.
(b) The faculty, for whom the university is the center of a lifetime career.
(c) The trustees who bear the burden for the financial operation of the university, and its protection from excessive pressures both from within and especially from without the university.
(d) The administration who are concerned with the operation of the university as an academic institution.

But though these groups have the primary stake in the university, they cannot operate in isolation. They must recognize the demands placed upon them by such related groups as alumni, parents, and the like. They also must acknowledge that the University does not operate isolated from general society. Hence there will be demands from government, business, the professions, and many other groups in society.

This characteristic of multiple constituencies, though not unique to the Cornell environment, causes two problems with regard to university decison making. The first is to somehow include these four constituencies in the decision making process and yet reflect the fact that the interest and concern each of these groups has in a decision -- and hence the role each plays in the decision making process - will vary, depending on the issues and policy area involved. The second problem is defining of what degree the decision making process should take cognizance of the other claims upon the university from society at large.

(3) An examination of the decision making process must also take into account the institutions of the university and how they function in the Cornell environment. A study of decision making must take cognizance of the present institutional arrangements and evaluate their operation. It must recognize the key role departments play in educational policy. And it must also evaluate the role of the central university administration in campus affairs.

On this latter point, it is clear that there are several problems involving the central administration and its operation. Though nominally this group is to have only a maintainence role, it is clear that many policy decisions are being made by the administration. These decisions may be made in two ways:

(a) Consciously by university officials working in the area of decision. The problem here is that other groups on campus -- especially the faculty and students, have only a minimal role in terms of input and actual participation in such decisions. It is not sufficient that an administrator merely consult with or inform the other constituencies of his actions. They must participate in these decisions for they are the groups primarily affected by them. The problem here is to open up these decisions that are not exclusively administration actions to participation of the other constituencies on the campus. Yet allowance must still be made for the valuable expertise that can be accumulated by administration officials -- giving such expertise proper weight in the decision making process.

(b) The second way policy decisions become the sole province of the administration is through an unconscious process that is characteristic of most bureaucracies. This is a process whereby policy decisions are made by administrators in the course of outlining administrative procedures and methods. A good example of this process was the policy with regard to the selective service that "evolved" in the Registrar's Office. The problem here is to design a structure including all four university constituencies that would be able to investigate instances when *policy has been made under the guise of administrative procedure. This group could then set a broad policy in the contested area and bind the administration to reflect this policy in its procedures.*

There is a special problem for students posed by a situation which allows many policy decisions to be made by the central administration. There are many informal ties between the faculty and the administration. A faculty member usually knows who to go to for attention to a matter that concerns him. By his position and reputation, he has at his command a measure of influence and bargaining power with which to deal with the administration. But the student is largely left out of this system of informal relationships. He has little credit and influence with the administration, and hence has a very poor bargaining position. Thus it is that though both faculty and students are often left out of the administration decision making process, the *concerns* of the faculty occupy a higher priority than those of the students. Lacking direct participation in the decisions made by the administration on an informal basis, the student resorts to violence and confrontation as the only way to get the university to heed his concerns, and to place him more prominently on its priority list. *Thus another problem in dealing with the central administration is to design a decision making process that includes both the students and faculty and reflects the inability of the student to get his concerns translated into university priorities through the devices of informal persuasion open to the faculty.*

There is another reason for the devolution of decision making to the central administration. This is the close relationship that administration has to the Board of Trustees. The top echelon of the Day Hall administration is responsible to the Board of Trustees, and they seem to best have the ear of the Trustees when it comes to university policy. The fact that the Trustees have the ultimate authority for setting policy reflects the assumption that a group which bears the financial responsibility of the university should therefore have the power of final decision. Financial control is equated to policy control, and a pre-eminent position in the decision making process. It is true that the Trustees have chosen to delegate much of this authority to the faculty, for instance. But on the broad question of the relation between the university and society, the Trustees almost alone have had the power to make decisions. For many of these decisions have been in the context of financial questions and issues regarding the university as a corporate entity (ex. CAL, Investment Policy, etc.) It must be recognized that the other university constituencies have an interest in these issues and have the right to participation in the decisions involving them. *Thus a fourth problem regarding institutions and decision making* is to include the other university constituencies in policy decision making related to the university's position as a corporate entity in society -- decisions that are now made almost soley by the trustees and the top echelon of Day Hall administration.

The fifth problem of university institutions is in the area of responsiveness. There is a phlethora of standing committees covering almost every aspect of university life. Yet the majority of these committees meet only once or twice annually, if that. The separation between these committees in regard to area of concern is also very vague. And these committees are often passive in nature, willing to respond to a problem or question brought to them but unwilling to actively investigate current policy to isolate problems before a complaint is raised and suggest improvements. The result is that the major decisions are now made outside these structures either by the administration or by commissions especially set up to respond to the "crisis issues". What good is a structure that lies dormant waiting for the big policy issues, and then is worthless when those issues finally arise? What is wrong with an institutionalized decision making process that has to create special commissions to deal with the most crucial issues because they appear outside the present policy making machinery, (i.e. draft policy, ROTC, relation to civil law -- the list is long)? It is obvious that much of our machinery is unresponsible and irrelevant. The fifth problem is thus to design policy making mechanisms that are active and innovative, with clearly defined spheres of competence, sufficient power to move in those spheres of concern, responsive to crisis, and relevant to the areas in which policy must be made.

There is a final aspect of institutions and their operation in the Cornell environment that must be considered. This is the history of the institutions of "student government" and what problems this history implies for student participation in university decision making. There are many lessons to be learned from this history.

(a) The first is that there is very real question as to the validity of the notion of representation in the Cornell student body. The student government of pre-1958 depended on organizations with identifiable constituencies to form the basis for a student government. Individuals were drawn from these organizations (usually the president) as representatives of groups that in turn were "representative" of different portions of the campus. This scheme was destroyed in the 1958 riots. It was replaced by an Executive Board of students elected campus wide but each supposed to represent a "constituency" -- fraternity representative, women's representative, etc. This structure perished under the charge of lack of representativeness. Finally Cornell saw the

Student Association which attempted representation on the basis of residential units. This scheme collapsed before it was born.

The upshot of this history is to question whether "representation" makes any sense in the Cornell student body. College Councils provide a poor base for representation because as constituencies they have students who have only the loosest tie together. Residential constituencies work better, for in dorms and group living units there is some cohesion and communication among the students. They could serve as a basis for a constituency system, but the system breaks down for college town and apartment living where there is no such group cohesion beyond the three or four man apartment. Representation on the basis of communication and cohesion is almost impossible.

Representation has also been based on "interests," but it too has failed. The problem is that the decisons made by any "representative" body would be related to political, academic, and environmental areas. What is an individual's "interest" group in one area would not be in another. The IFC might represent a fraternity man's interest in residential matters but SDS might represent him better on political issues. Hence the problem is selecting which set of "interests" is to be the basis of representation.

This representation by interest groups has been thwarted by a hostility to using organizations as the basis of representation. Students do not appear to be content with a method that selects students from organizations that in turn represent students (as WSGA, IFC, etc.); they prefer something more direct and responsive.

Bluntly, the problem is to include students in the university decision making process without depending on a system of "representation" of the student body. All of the so-called representative student governments have been ultimately rejected by the students and challenged as merely providing only the appearance of representation.

(b) The second lesson of the history of student government is that students have rejected the notion of a separate "government" structure. This was the motivating force in the drive to get students on the FCSA and in the abolition of the Student Association. One of the factors that contributed to the demise of the Executive Board was the realization of its impotence in the face of the faculty which possessed ultimate power to approve or veto. The Executive Board was reduced to the status of a lobby, and when the left proved that confrontation was more effective than lobby, the Executive Board was finished. If decisions are made by faculty and administration organizations, and if students are to take part in these decisions, then they must participate directly in these organizations. The problem is not to design a separate student government structure to legislate on student affairs but to include students in the university policy making structures. This implies a recognition of students as a constituent in the university as a whole and rightfully participating in decisions that affect the university as a whole, not merely narrowly defined "student affairs."

The Problems in Decision Making at Cornell

The previous discussion has revealed several problems in designing a procedure for decision making at Cornell. From these problems one can isolate various conditions that a policy formation scheme must fulfill at Cornell.

(1) It must include the five major campus constituencies -- faculty, students, administration, non-academic staff, and trustees -- while reflecting their different interests and concerns in the role each plays in decisions in a given area.

(2) It must take cognizance of the claims upon the university from society at large. All five constituencies must be included in decisions realting to the university's position as a corporate entity with respect to that society.

(3) The decisions that are now made almost soley by administration actions must be opened up to the participation of those other constituencies, yet allowance made for the expertise that can be contributed by administration officials.

(4) The decision-making procedure must allow these other constituencies to investigate instances when policy has been made under the guise of administrative procedure, and have the power to approve or alter that policy.

(5) The policy-making mechanisms must be active and innovative, with clearly defined spheres of competence, sufficient power to move in those spheres of concern, responsive to crisis, and relevant to the areas in which policy must be made.

(6) Students must not be "included" in a separate student government structure legislating on narrowly defined student affairs. They must be recognized as a constituent in the university as a whole, included directly in university policy-making structures, and rightfully participating in decisions that affect the university as a whole.

(7) Student participation in the decision making process must reflect the inability of students to get their concerns on the university priority list through the devices of informal persuasion open to the faculty.

(8) Students must be included in the university decision making process without depending on a system of "representation" of the student body. The minority of active students interested in taking a role in university decision making must be allowed to do so, while still permitting the majority of the student body to exert a check upon these students on specific issues when its interest is aroused.

The Student"s Role

A measure of explanation is needed to clarify the statement previously made concerning the importance of participation of even a minority of interested students with preovision for a majority check upon them. It would be easy to use the apathy that is often manifest among Cornell students to discount student aparticipation in decision making. But this would be foolish for two reasons: (1) It would neglect the times when the campus at large has shown acute interest in specific campus issues, as the Executive Board's Viet Nam Resolutions, the issues raised by SFE, the busing of students to the Mobilization, etc. Students have been uninvolved about much of the day-to-day operation of the university, and rightly so. But they have demonstrated their concern, and overcome this uninvolvement, on many key issues of the past.

(2) Even if only a minority of the student body were interested in the issues relating to university policy, a case still could be made for student participation (even minority participation) in the decision process. Many reasons can be given for the inclusion of students in this process:

(a) Students have a right to such participation as citizens of the university in the same sense that faculty are citizens, and to a great extent students desire this participation.
(b) Students can contribute to the making of better decisions by adding another perspective into the decision process -- the perspective of those who feel the effects of many university policies.
(c) The participation would be instructive to the student, giving him a chance to learn about policy making process and see the function and operation of institutions in a community.

The last two reasons are the most important and they do not depend on an activated majority demanding participation. The objectives of better decisions and instruction to the student could be achieved even if only a minority of the student body were interested in campus-centered issues. What any student can contribute to the decision process is the point of view of those "whom the shoe pinches." This is what students have in common, this perspective as the receivers of the effects of policy. The individual student retains this perspective, and hence is able to enrich the decision process, whether he is "representative" of a large active and interested student body or whether he participates merely as an individual student -- for "student" is the key. And that student will learn from the experience of participation in decision making whether he is "representative" or merely acting as an individual.

Thus to emphasize the uninvolvement among students as a reason to deny them participation in the decision process is fruitless. It ignores the interest the student body does exhibit in specific issues, and it fails to discredit the primary reasons for having student participation in the first place.

This also explains why provision must be made to allow the majority of the students to have a check on the minority who actually participate in the decision process. To fail to provide for such a check would ignore the interest great numbers of students have shown in the past on specific campus issues and set a high level to what is demanded of a student in order to make his voice heard. This is what is implicit in the move from referendum to open meeting as the basic technique of establishing policy positions among students. It sets up a higher requirement before a student's vote is counted. On a very general level, the often noninvolved majority of the campus could be characterized as non-meeting oriented. They are sometimes willing to cast a ballot, but rarely to sit through a long meeting. To formulate student policy positions by the open meeting method would exclude this group of students. Those who would respond to this system and attend the open meeting are the same students who would be active and interested enough to sit on faculty and administration committees in the first place.

It is not fair to ignore the interest the bulk of the students have often shown on specific issues and allow the minority of more active and interested students to have sole control of the student position on policy matters either through giving them free rein on faculty-administration committees or employing the open meeting technique of policy-position formation. The student on these committees is not a "representative" of the students through any constituency scheme or the like. The notion of such representation has already been discredited. But at the same time the student is not operating in a vacuum but is making policy that will affect his fellow students. For this reason the latter have a right to express their stance on major policy issues and exercise a degree of control over those policies through the students on the committee. It is only in this sense that a student member of a policy body is a "representative" of the students. This right to exercise such a check should not be thwarted by a procedure which, by demanding a great deal before granting a voice in policy position formation, could not accommodate all of the students if they did satisfy this requirement. Such is the problem with government by open meeting. If 10,000 students did respond, it would be totally unmanageable. It is the virtue of referendum that it could handle such interest.

Furthermore it has been the conclusion of the Commission that students should be interested and concerned in their education and the issues that involve the university community. If this is true, then a restrictive method of expressing a policy preference would be antithetical to this principle for it would squash the interest that substantial numbers of students have expressed in the past on these issues. The check of the majority is not only a right but also an important means of encouraging the interest and concern about the university that should characterize every student.

Thus what is emerging is a scheme of participation by interested students in university decision making not as "representatives" of the students in the normal sense but merely subject to check by the majority of students on the most major issues in a referendum. This has been justified on several grounds:

(1) It is democratic, and this involves an assumption that policy formation should reflect the interests of the majority and that the majority best sees and watches out for its interests.
(2) But it also allows the participating students great latitude in their position on policy making bodies. It recognizes the lack of content to "representation" as normally understood -- involving the link to specific constituencies and interest groups.
(3) It seeks to encourage, not stifle the growth of concern in university and educational interests that should characterize every student.

This scheme must also serve to encourage student interest and participation through its institutions -- since it is felt such interest is a virtue to be encouraged. Hence actual participation should not be open only to the already active and interested but also somehow incorporate less "activated" individuals to awaken this interest in them. It seems that apathy is to a great extent the product of lack of understanding of the mechanism of decision making and its relevance to the student. Hence participation and interest will grow together. It must not be insisted that interest be evident necessarily before participation, for this is to ignore how involvement even in a small way encourages interest and furthers participation.

This is why the notion of waiting until students have identified themselves as a body, developed widespread interest in student concerns, and demanded participation seems incomplete. It also would defer the beneficial role interested students could play now to a day sometime in the future -- if at all.

A more convincing challenge to the method outlined above is that giving active minorities full rein would be the most effective way of "awakening" the majority -- by so alienating them that they would be forced to organize and take charge. But what would probably happen is that an opposition faction would arise to oppose the minority in control of the student positions in decision making bodies. This faction would not be representative of a majority, but merely a minority -- extreme in the other direction. This is similar to what happened with the issue of subsidy to buses for the mobilization. When the Executive Board backed SDS, the protest that arose took the form of STOP. The majority chose to express itself through referendum rather than counter-organization.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The Chairman of the Commission finds himself in almost complete agreement with the analytical parts of Mr. Hadley's presentation. It may, however, be worthwhile to call attention to the following considerations regarding some of the recommendations.

Although the case for student participation by special minority interest is persuasively made, it should be born in mind that experience with such schemes in other situations is not reassuring. For example, the whole progress of English Democracy from the first reform bill to the abolition of the university seats in parliment a few years ago has been away from the weighted representation of special groups to a more generalized geographical pattern. Students in government can easily provide other examples of the failure of syndicalist models in the late medievel and early Renaissance periods as well as in various Latin countries in modern times.

Majority rule of any kind, especially in a pattern which provides for a referendum on controversial matters by what is explicitly defined as a relatively uniformed student body may well be incompatible with the traditional role of the university. Many of us would feel, for example, that the primary role of a university is to provide society with a wide variety of ideas, and with graduates trained in a wide variety of ways. Ezra Cornell "would found a university where any person could study any subject." Like all preambles there is something metaphorical about this statement, but like all good metaphors it states an important truth. The Board of Trustees and faculty of Cornell have steadfastly fostered the rights of students to study if not "any subject" at least a wider variety than commonly recognized as part of a university curriculum when they were instituted - from Animal Husbandry, through Hotel Management to Black Studies. It is not now clear that this principle would fare as well in the hands of a shifting majority of students.

II D The University and National Policy

As pointed out in the introduction of this report and mentioned from time to time elsewhere, one of the greatest problems facing the university is its relationship to society at large. Reasons have been given for the view that there is no way of avoiding this matter since the university is already so deeply involved in society in so many different ways. The Commission debated the matter on several occasions, and the earlier parts of the report reflect what the Chairman learned from these discussions. What follows, however, is the result of independent reflection.

It is now obvious that a great deal of campus unrest is due to the identification of the university by the student with national policies which he abhors. The Amherst declaration of May 2, 1969, makes it very clear that the roots of campus disorders are to be found largely in the field of national policy. The question then becomes "how sensible is it to use the university as a corporate entity to change national policy, a proposal which in its extreme form, counsels the destruction of the university as a means of destroying a corrupt society.

The reason for discussing this question in this section of the report is because of its bearing on how any new body set up to make overall university policy should function.

Arguments will be given to support the view that the University Council should confine itself to making policy only as it affects the university. It should not make policy as a means of directly influencing the policies of other social political institutions. Thus the University had every right to discontinue secret research on campus since it could demonstrate that it was bad for the University. It was bad primarily because it interfered with freedom of inquiry and especially with freedom of teaching. It would have been unsound for the University to bar secret research on the grounds that such research is bad for the nation. This question must be argued in a larger arena by individuals and by groups explicitly set up to serve such political purposes.

Similarly the University has a right to consider the conditions under which the ROTC may operate on campus as such operation affects its other obligations. It is not correct to withdraw from ROTC primarily as a means of forcing the Pentagon to stop the Viet Nam War.

Let us take another less highly charged example. The university has not yet taken a position on the building of a new power plant on Lake Cayuga. It has, however, encouraged its biologists and engineers to make studies of its probable effects both on the ecology of the region and the cost of power. It has also allowed the members of the staff to organize groups opposing construction and has made its facilities available for public presentation of their views. It would ultimately be correct and proper for the university to oppose the building of the station officially because of its probable adverse effects on the Cornell environment. The university should not prejudge the situation, however, nor oppose construction on general social grounds; least of all should it try to stop construction by preventing its faculty staff from engaging in the necessary preliminary studies.

When then does the study of this and other examples (history is full of them) tell us about the way a new body set up to share responsibility for overall university policy should operate.

1. Its primary criteria should be the effects of proposed policies on the operation of the university itself. In this connection it must always be remembered that the primary purpose of the university is to provide society with the widest variety of trained people, new ideas, and new technologies. It must also provide information to society on the probable effects of the application of new ideas and technologies so that society can make wise choices (in the past it has too often slighted this last obligation).

2. It should not take specific positions on subjects of public controversy except in so far as the subject bears directly on the university itself.

3. It should certainly allow, and probably encourage, individuals and groups within the university to take positions on social and political issues and to work actively in support of them. It should not allow the use of coercion, or interference with normal functioning of the university as a means of political persuasion.

The following comments on these three fundamental points may be in order.

1. Society at least tacitly recognizes the importance of the university as a provider of a variety of ideas from which the fittest may later be chosen by natural and sometimes deliberate selection. It is therefore, prepared to allow a greater degree of individual freedom and eccentricity than exists in most other institutions. For this and other reasons the members of university faculties have tended to be in advance of the population at large in the acceptance of new ideas. Dawrinian evolution was accepted in most universities before it was by the Church of England, or the legislatures of some American States. Keynesian economics was a commonplace in both Cambridge, England and Cambridge, Mass. a decade before it became recognized as an important part of national fiscal policy. The evils and illegalities of U.S. attitudes in Southeast Asia were being analyzed and promulgated by university experts nearly 15 years before the Senate Foreign Regulations Committee dared to question executive decisions on the war.

It must be admitted, on the other hand, that even the best universities fail to realize their full potential as innovators. Not only are the external pressures normally on the side of the status quo, but the traditional hierarchical structure of the university, as well as the normal complacency of comfortable middle class faculty members tend to inhibit rapid change. The university community has been unconscionably slow, for example, to recognize that the nation's educational system from kindergarten to postdoctoral study, while almost ideally adapted to the needs of upwardly mobile middle class Jews and only slightly less so to those of white Anglo Saxon Protestants, has not done so well by Irish and Italian Catholics and is almost totally useless to all but a minority of the blacks who have been a part of American society for much longer than most of the rest of us.

As an example of a similar log, at the technological level, there are probably still many more faculty members preaching the virtues of extensive use of fertilizers and insecticides than in warning farmers and the general public against the long-term dangers.

Perhaps most serious is the failure of the university to recognize the full implications of its various relationships with military matters. For various historical reasons these relationships are much closer than they were before 1940. The case for or against the participation of the university in unclassified research supported by the Department of Defense is too complicated to argue in detail here. Let us simply assert that the share of university personnel devoted to topics of interest to the military is unduly high in relation to those devoted to studying other methods of preserving our national honor and settling international differences.

All these imbalances and complacencies and many more are fit subjects for discussion and decision by any body set up to consider overall university policy and to suggest methods for change. The emphasis however, should be on developing new approaches to the solution of national problems in ways appropriate to the university rather than on a mere negative withdrawal from presumably undesirable activity.

2. What are the arguments that support the notion that the university should refrain from taking public positions on controversial matters? There are two major ones, the first is somewhat theoretical and philosophical, the second is intensly practical.

As we have seen the university presents itself to society as the protector of the widest variety of opinion and variation. Above all, it stands for the concept that ideas should not be prejudged; they must be allowed to develop in a protected atmosphere before being tried in the crucible of experience. Society has come to respect this need and to tolerate the university in its role as innovator. It is logically inconsistent for the university, the primary initiator and protector of variations, to select certain ideas for special protection or promulgation.

The practical difficulties involved in making the university into a political instrument are formidable. As we have emphasized many times in this paper, the university is made for variety. It is inherently difficult for a faculty to get together around a single point of view on any political matter. The addition of Trustees and students complicates the problem even further. The mere mechanics of debate and the polling procedures necessary to determine the community's view on political matters would be cumbersome and time consuming. Grave problems would arise in regard to weighing the votes of the various constituencies to arrive at a single corporate opinion.

Most damaging of all is the high probability that some of the most capable and sincere faculty members would resign rather than be associated with an official institutional position with which they sharply disagreed. The attempt to forge the university into a single weapon of social and political reform is thus likely to end in the destruction of its primary role as a multiple, independently targeted critic of society. By now it should be clear to everyone that the university is far from the indestructible monolithic oppressive power structure pictured in the fantasies of some students. As a political organization it is actually unusually fragile, and it we aren't careful it may fall apart before we realize how fragile it is.

3. It is equally a fact that the university contains many members with strong feelings on political and social matters. Indeed, the sharp increase in student interest in national and world issues has struck most of us as a great improvement over the apathy of 1950's. What has not yet been learned is how to aim this energy directly on the appropriate targets in the political and social world outside the university.

The power spent in crumpling ROTC on the campus does not always reach the Pentagon nor the Armed Forces Committees of the Congress that are the primary engines of the military industrial complex. In any case, the hated Viet Nam War is not solely or even primarily a product of the military, many of whom have always had severe misgivings about land wars in Asia. Civilian diplomats have played an important role and until relatively recently they have had the support of a majority of the electorate. Campus obscenities, threats, and in some cases sticks and stones directed at visiting diplomats attempting to explain their positions have not done much to turn the electorate away from the war. Indeed, the evidence is convincing that continuing campus disorders, however elevated their motives, are turning the electorate against the universities in considerable numbers.

So what should politically active students do? In the first place they should aim their energies at appropriate targets in the outside world. The early days of the McCarthy campaign shows how effective student power can be if properly focused. A determined effort to lower the voting age to 18 should be undertaken at once and would probably be successful, especially if coupled with an effort to restore more responsible behavior on campus. Possession of the vote would help to bring the weight of student opinion to bear directly on legislative and executive action, and of course, increase the influence of youth in political campaigns. It would simultaneously relieve one of the sources of the feeling of political powerlessness that affects so many young people; and it would give more pith and moment to campus organizations dedicated to political action through normal channels.

The university should work closely with other elements in society to develop more channels for appropriate social and political action. Summer "internship" with Congressional Committees and other government bodies have helped a few students to a better understanding of how things may actually be accomplished in the political world. The Peace Corps and Vista are on the whole successful examples of larger scale opportunities for social reform. Many students would probably profit by taking a year off during their college years to participate in social or political affairs. At present the draft laws make such a course dangerous. The universities would certainly be justified in making a strong case for revision of the draft laws because of their very deterious effects on both undergraduate and graduate education.

This is clearly not the place to explore all the ways in which a university can help its students to become politically active without identifying itself with particular sides of particular questions. It is hoped that enough has been said to call attention to the importance of the problem and indicate that the legitimate political interests of students can be expressed more effectively than they are now in ways which will do less damage to the university

These observations are included in this section of the report because of their bearing on the design of University Council for the making of overall policy. If they are correct, it would appear that such a body should be capable of protecting and fostering the legitimate political interests of faculty and students and helping to find effective ways of directing them towards appropriate targets. On the other hand, it need not and probably should not be designed to engage the University as a corporate entity in political affairs.

WORKING BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following titles may be borrowed from the Commission's shelf in B-19 Day Hall at any time.

1. "Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities." Summer, 1962.
2. "Comprehensive Residential Program Adopted." *Cornell Reports*, summer, 1968.
3. Dennis, L. and Kauffman, J. (editors). (1966). *The College and the Student*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
4. "Faculty-Student-Administration Forum."
5. "The General Legislature of the University Faculty and Extracts From Its Record." 10/12/66--5/10/67.
6. Goodman, Paul. "Freedom and Learning: The Need for Choice." *Saturday Review*, 5/18/68.
7. Goodman, Paul. "The New Aristocrats." *Playboy*.
8. "Governance of Universities, Rights and Responsibilities: A Study in Academic Ethics." Boston: House of the Academy. 11/14/68--11/16/68.
9. Halleck, S.L. (1967). "The Roots of Despair." *Think.*
10. Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. (1968). *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc.
11. "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedom of Students." Winter, 1967.
12. "Madison Campus Standing Committees."
13. Muller, Steven. "Thoughts on University Government." 6/17/68.
14. Nicolaus, Martin. "Remarks at A.S.A. Convention."
15. *New York Times Magazine*, interview with Marcuse.
16. "Outline: Central Administration Structure." 8/12/68.
17. Penny,Norman. Remarks of Prof. Penny at the Cornell Faculty Seminar on "The Negro in Higher Education." 6/7/68.

18. Research Seminar on Student Conduct and Discipline, NYU School of Law (1968). "Student Conduct and Discipline Proceedings in a University Setting."

19. "Report of the University Commission on Residential Environment." 6/11/67.

20. "Report of the University of Minnesota Commission on Demonstrations." Minneapolis, Minn: Univ. of Minnesota. 4/24/68.

21. Searle, J. R. "Essay: Freedom and Order in the University."

22. Sindler, Allan P. "The Sindler Commission Report: the university commission on the interdependence of university regulations and local, state, and federal law." 10/2/67.

23. "The Study of Education at Stanford; Report to the University." 10 small volumes.

24. Szymanski, Albert. "Toward a Radical Sociology." GSS Journal, Journal of the Graduate Sociology Student Union, Columbia University. 6/68.

25. "University Center System: Center System Administrative Structure." 11/67.

26. Wallis, Allen (1965). in Daedelus.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Students

We begin our analysis with students since student unrest is the initial reason for the commission's existence. The literature on students falls into a number of categories: first, student movements, historical and current; second, sociological and psychological studies of students under less political circumstances, including studies of students as learners, as developing personalities, and as members of the university community.

A. Student movements

1. History of student movements

a. Anarchism and nihilism

Student movements in the past have had important politcal implications, particularly where these movements have been joined by other groups, such as political parties and labor organizations. There are extremely interesting parallels between the nihilism of students in Russia in the 1860's and current patterns. This is particularly apparent in the anarchistic rejection of the "establishment" as the source of all social and human ills. Problems can only be solved by eliminating the system.

See:

"Anarchism." *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1968.

Horowitz, Irving L. *Radicalism and the Revolt Against Reason: The Social Theories of Georges Sorel.* N.Y.: Humanities, 1961.

"Nihilism." *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1911.

"Nihilism." Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1933.

Woodcock, George. Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements. N.Y.: Meridian, 1962.

b. Youth movements

There have been a number of other types of youth movements in addition to the mid-19th century nihilistic revolt in Russia. Of particular interest is the German youth movement before World War I strongly influenced by Nietzsche and others and characterized by the "desire for a new way of life, for greater liberty, sincerity and beauty as opposed to the materialism, conventionalism and insincerity of Wilhelmine society." This movement was idealistic and characterized by a revival of folk song, folk dances, and folk lore and stimulated by philosophy and poetry.

We might also be interested in how the pre-war youth movement in Germany merged with Fascism and National Socialism in the post-war period.

See:

"Youth Movements." Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1934.

2. Current

a. Students and politics

The new student left is perhaps the most significant new feature of campus life. There has been much written on the subject. The following are representative:

Birtz, Otto, ed. To Make A Difference. N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1967.

Cohen, Mitchell and Dennis Hale. The New Student Left. Boston: Beacon Pr., 1967.

Davidson, Carl. "University Reform Revisited." Educational Record, vol. 48, no. 1, winter 1967, pp. 5-10.

Draper, Hal. Berkeley: The New Student Revolt. N.Y.: Grove Press, 1965.

Dubin, Robert and Frederic Beisse. "The Assistant: Academic Subaltern." Administrative Science Quarterly, vol. 2, no. 4, March 1967, pp. 521-547.

Freeman, Castle W., Jr. "The Psychology of Revolt: How It Felt at Columbia." College and University Business, vol. 44, no. 6, June 1968, pp. 54-56.

Keniston, Kenneth. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

Knorr, D. A. and W. V. Minter, eds. Order and Freedom on the Campus. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.

Lipset, S.M. Student Politics. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1967.

Lipset, S.M. and Sheldon Wolin, eds. The Berkeley Student Revolt. N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor, 1965.

Miller, Michael and Susan Gilmore, eds. Revolution at Berkeley. N.Y.: Dell, 1965.

Newfield, Jack. A Prophetic Minority. N.Y.: New American Library, 1966.

Peterson, Richard E. The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-1965. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

"Students and Politics." Daedalus, vol. 97, no. 1, winter 1968.

Wert, Robert J. "The SDS Has a Battle Plan for Wrecking U. S. Universities." College Management, summer 1968, pp. 29 & 45. (Excerpts from a centennial address delivered at the Univ. of California at Santa Cruz.)

b. Student life: sociological and psychological studies and analyses

See:

American Council on Education. The Student in Higher Education. Wash. D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Becker, Howard S., Blanche Geer, Everett C. Hughes, and Anselm Strauss. Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1961.

Blaine, Graham B., Jr. Youth and the Hazards of Affluence. N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1966.

Freedman, Mervin B. The College Experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1967.

Golden, M. Patricia and Ned A. Rosen. "Student Attitudes Toward Participation in University Administration: An Empirical Study Related to Managerial Prerogatives." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Nov. 1966, pp. 323-330.

Golden, Rose K., et al. What College Students Think. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1960.

Jacob, Philip. Changing Values in College. N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1957.

Lloyd-Jones, Esther M. and Herman A. Estrin, eds. The American Student and His College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.

Minter, W. John, ed. The Individual and the System: Personalizing Higher Education. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Univ. of Colorado, 1967.

Newcomb, Theodore M. and Everett K. Wilson. College Peer Groups. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1966.

Sanford, Nevitt. Where Colleges Fail: A Study of the Student as a Person. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Williamson, E. G. and John L. Cowan. The American Student's Freedom of Expression. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Pr., 1966.

Yamamoto, Kaoru. The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

II. Faculty

It is a bit difficult to separate studies of faculty behavior from studies of the university organization as a whole since the faculty is so dominant a part of the university community. Members of the commission may find the following of interest:

Berelson, Bernard. Graduate Education in the United States. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Caplow, Theodore and Reece J. McGee. The Academic Marketplace. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1958.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *The Flight from Teaching*. N.Y.: 1964.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles - I." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, Dec. 1957, p. 290.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles - II." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, March 1958, p. 465.

Jenks, Christopher and David Riesman. *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens, Jr. *The Academic Mind*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958.

Lee, Calvin B. T. *Improving College Teaching*. Wash. D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Lewis, Lionel S. "On Prestige and Loyalty of University Faculty." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, II, 4, March 1967, pp. 629-642.

Machlup, Fritz. *The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Pr., 1962.

Riesman, David. *Constraint and Variety in American Education*. Lincoln, Nebraska: Univ. of Nebraska Pr., 1956.

Rossi, Peter and Bruce J. Biddle, eds. *The New Media and Education*. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Sanford, Nevitt, ed. *The American College*. N.Y.: Wiley, 1962.

Wilson, Logan. *The Academic Man*. Oxford Pr., 1942. .

III. Organization and Administration of the University

There is a great mass of material on the organization and administration of the university, most of which I have not culled. In the list below, note the library reference numbers on a number of the items.

Adams, Richard P. "Tulane University: Faculty Participation in the Government of the University." *AAUP Bulletin*, vol. 49, no. 3, September 1963.

Association of American Universities. "Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and Their Faculties." (Pamphlet L 128).

Becker, Carl. *The Founders and the Founding*. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Pr.

Benjamin, Harold. *Democracy in the Administration of Higher Education*. (L101 U58 J65) 1950.

Black, Max, F. G. Marcham, and George Winter. "Faculty-Trustee Relationships." *AAUP Bulletin*, 42, 1956, pp. 613-624.

Blackwell, T. E. *College and University Administration*. (Mann, LB2341 B63)

Brown, Ralph S., Jr. "Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty." *AAUP Bulletin*, vol. 52, no. 2, June 1966.

Burns, Gerald P. *Administrators in Higher Education*. (LB2341 B96)

Caffrey, John and Charles J. Mossman. *Computers on Campus: A Report to the President on Their Use and Management.* Wash. D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Capen, Samuel P. *The Management of Universities*. (LB2341 C23)

Carron, Malcolm. *The Contract Colleges of Cornell*. (LD1346.5 C31)

The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. *The University in America*. Sanata Barbara: 1966.

Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Authority." *AAUP Bulletin*, vol. 47, no. 4, December 1961.

Cornell University. *Bylaws*. June 13, 1955.

Cornell University. Special Committee on Faculty Organization and Procedures at Cornell University. 1957.

Corson, John J. *Governance of Colleges and Universities*. (LB2341 C77 ILR)

Demerath, Nicholas J. *Power, Presidents and Professors*. 1967. (LB2341 D4)

Dibden, Arthur J. "Faculty People and College Power." *AAUP Bulletin*, vol. 45, no. 4, Dec. 1959.

Dieckhoff, John S. *The Domain of the Faculty*. (LB2331 D55)

Dodds, H. W. *The Academic President*. (LB2341 D64)

Eckert, Ruth E. "The Share of the Teaching Faculty in University Policy-Making." *AAUP Bulletin*, vol. 45, no. 3, September 1959.

Education at Berkeley. The Report of the Select Committee on Education of the Academic Senate at Berkeley. Berkeley: Univ. of California Printing Dept., March 1966.

"Faculty Participation in College and University Government: Statement of Principles." *AAUP Bulletin*, vol. 46, no. 2, June 1960.

"Faculty Participation in College and University Government." *AAUP Bulletin*, vol. 48, no. 1, Mar. 1962; vol. 48, no. 4, Dec. 1962; vol. 49, no. 3, Sept. 1952.

Gross, Neal. "Organization Lag in American Universities: Disparities Between Goals and Structural Arrangements." *Harvard Educational Review*, 33, 1963, pp. 58-73.

Gould, Samuel B. "A Place to Stand." Commencement Exercises, State University College at New Paltz (New York) June 9, 1968.

Hill, Winston W. and Wendell L. French. "Perceptions of the Power of Department Chairmen by Professors." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. II, no. 4, Mar. 1967, pp. 548-574.

Hughes, Raymond M. "A Manual for Trustees of Colleges and Universities." Ames, Iowa State College Pr., 1951.

"Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students." *AAUP Bulletin*, 53, 4, Dec. 1967, pp. 365-368.

Joyal, Arnold E. *Faculty Participation in College Policy*. (LB2341 J88)

Kagan, Donald. "On University Government." *Cornell Alumni News*, April 1966.

Keeney, Barnaby. "The Function of the President as Interpreted in the *Memo*." *Journal of Higher Education*, 30, Nov. 1959, pp. 246-31.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1963.

Kerr, Clark, et al. *The University in America*. Center for Study of Democratic Institutions, Jan. 1967.

Kimball, Solon T. "Social Science Research and Higher Education." *Human Organization*, 21, 1962-63, pp. 271-279.

Litchfield, Edward H. "The University: A Congeries or an Organic Whole." *AAUP Bulletin*, vol. 45, no. 3, Sept. 1959.

Lunsford, Terry F., ed. *The Study of Academic Administration*. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Oct. 1963.

Marcham, F. G. "Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees." *AAUP Bulletin*, 42, 1956, pp. 617-619.

Marshall, M. S. "How to Be a Dean." *AAUP Bulletin*, 42, Dec. 1956, pp. 636-643.

Martorama, S. V. *College Boards of Trustees*. Wash. D.C.: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.

McNeil, Gordon H. "Faculty Participation in College and University Government: A Utilitarian Approach." *AAUP Bulletin*, 48, 4, Dec. 1962.

Millett, John D. The Academic Community. An Essay in Organization. (LB2341 M65)

Morison, Robert S. The Contemporary University: USA. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Perkins, James A. The University in Transition. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Pr., 1966.

Porter, Kirk H. "Department Head or Chairman." AAUP Bulletin, 47, 4, Dec. 1961.

Prator, Ralph. The College President. (Mann, LB2341 P91)

Rauh, Morton A. College and University Trusteeship. (LB2341 R24)

Rosenheim, Edward, J. "Letter to a New Dean." AAUP Bulletin, 49, 3, Sept. 1963.

Rourke, Francis E. and Glenn E. Brooks. "Computers and University Administration." Administrative Science Quarterly, II, 4, March 1967, pp. 575-600.

Rourke, Francis E. and Glenn E. Brooks. "'The Managerial Revolution' in Higher Education." Administrative Science Quarterly, 9, Sept. 1964, pp. 156-157.

Ruml, B. and D. H. Morrison. Memo to A College Trustee. N.Y.; McGraw Hill, 1959. (LB2341 R93)

"Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." AAUP Bulletin, Winter, 1966.

Stewart, George R. "On University Government." AAUP Bulletin, 47, 1, March 1961.

Stoke, Harold. The American College President. N.Y.: Harper & Bros., 1959. (LB2341 S87)

Stoke, Harold W. Viewpoints for the Study of the Administration. Univ. of Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1966.

Stroup, Herbert. Bureaucracy in Higher Education. N.Y.: The Free Press, 1966.

Sullivan, R. M. "Administration-Faculty Relationships in Colleges and Universities." Journal of Higher Education, 27, June 1956, pp. 308-326.

Trippett, B. K. "The Role of a Faculty in College Administration." *AAUP Bulletin*, 43, Sept. 1957, pp. 484-491.

Winter, George. "Faculty-Trustee Communications." *AAUP Bulletin*, 42, 1956, pp. 620-623.

Woodburne, Lloyd S. *Principles of College and University Administration*. Palo Alto, Stanford Univ. Pr., 1958. (LB2341 W88 P9)

IV. General

There are general bibliographies on various aspects of higher education. For a review of the field, see Betsy Ann Olive, "The Administration of Higher Education: A Bibliographical Survey." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 2, no. 4, March, 1967. In this survey, the following references are given:

Eells, Walter C. and Ernest V. Hollis. *The College Presidency, 1900-1960: An Annotated Bibliography.* Wash. D.C.: U.S. Office of Education Bulletin 1961, no. 9, 1961.
Eells, Walter C. and Ernest V. Hollis. *Administration of Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography*. Wash. D.C.: U.S. Office of Education Bulletin 1960, no. 7, 1960.

Harris, Chester W., ed. *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. 3rd ed. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1960.

Review of Educational Research. 35, 1965, pp. 247-372.

Journals of interest include the following:

AAUP Bulletin

The Educational Record

Sociology of Education

Harvard Educational Review

A miscellany of journals like *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Sociometry*, *Human Organization*, etc.